HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLVI JULY, 1953 NUMBER 3

'KNOWLEDGE' IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND MATTHEW 11:25–30[1]

W. D. DAVIES
DUKE UNIVERSITY

INTERPRETERS of Matthew 11:25–30 have fallen roughly into two classes. On the one hand, there are those who have been content to explain the passage solely in the light of the Old Testament,[2] and, on the other, those who have traced in it a common pattern, ultimately deriving from Eastern theosophy, which emerges in Ecclesiasticus 51, and elsewhere, and reappears in Matthew 11:25–30, through the agency of certain primitive Christian *thiasoi* of a 'mystical' type.[3] Not far removed from this is the view that, both on account of style and content, the passage is to be understood in the light of Hellenistic Gnosticism.[4] These different interpretations revolve chiefly around the nature of the *gnosis* revealed in the passage, and we shall here seek to show that the recently discovered Dead Sea Scrolls (*DSS*), along with the Damascus Fragment (*CDC*),[5] introduce us to a milieu which

[1] I should like to acknowledge the ready helpfulness of my colleague Professor W. H. Brownlee in all matters pertaining to the relevant literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls, and in the interpretation of the texts themselves.

[2] So among others, A. H. McNeile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew, 1918, p. 166; Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, 1937, p. 37; W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, 1943, pp. 71f.; C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, 1953, ad. loc.; the most recent treatment strongly supports this view, see Julius Schniewind, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, 1950. For a full discussion see also B. S. Easton, The Gospel According to St. Luke, 1926. On its relation to 'Wisdom' passages in the N.T., see W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 1948, ad. loc.

[3] E. Norden, Agnostos Theos, 1913, ad. loc.; also Tomas Arvedson, Das Mysterium Christi eine Studie zu Mt. 11:25–30, Uppsala, 1937.

[4] M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, Eng. Trans., 1935, pp. 279ff.; R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition,[2] 1931, pp. 171–2.

[5] In the following pages *DSS* stands for Dead Sea Scrolls, *CDC* for the Damascus Fragment, *DSH* for the Habakkuk Commentary, *DST* for the Psalms of Thanksgiving. Except where otherwise stated I have used the translations of W. H. Brownlee, Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 10–12, 1951 for *DSD* and his translation of *DSH* in BASOR, Nos. 112–114 for December 1948 and April 1949; other translations are used as mentioned in the text. For the Hebrew texts themselves I have used The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary, 1950, The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's

throws much light on the *gnosis* concerned. The existence of such a milieu has indeed been long suspected and even recognized but is now, if we accept the dating of the *DSS* which seems acceptable to most scholars,[6] even more clearly established. The nature of this milieu will appear as we proceed.

But in the first place it is well to mention three points of possible similarity between Matthew and the *DSS* which make it reasonable for us to seek illumination from these in elucidation of problems in Matthew. Too much weight should not be placed upon them, but they at least supply some justification for our procedure. They are as follows:

1. In *DSD* V:26–VI:1 there are certain regulations for the treatment of offenders which, as Brownlee has noted, recall unmistakably those in Matthew 18:15–17.[7] It is questionable whether we are to take Matthew 18:15–17 as the words of Jesus. More likely we are to see in them a bit of primitive Church Order which Matthew has incorporated into the tradition.[8] Moreover, since Paul appears to be familiar with somewhat similar regulations, I Cor. 5ff., it is precarious to connect Matthew too closely with the kind of milieu from which the *DSS* emerged on this ground alone.[9]

Monastery, 1951, both edited by Millar Burrows with the assistance of J. C. Trever and W. H. Brownlee, and E. L. Sukenik, Megilloth Genuzoth, Vol. I, II, Jerusalem, 1948, 1950. For the *CDC* I used Solomon Schechter, Fragments of a Zadokite Work, edited from Hebrew MSS in the Cairo Genizah Collection, Cambridge, 1910.

[6] We cannot here enter into the already vast literature on this question: for this consult H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and The Dead Sea Scrolls, 1952, where the exhaustive footnotes supply invaluable guidance.

[7] BASOR, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 10–12, 1951, p. 23 n. 3.

[8] A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 266 although he thinks that some genuine sayings of Jesus lie behind the passage; E. Klostermann, op. cit., ad loc., following Bultmann, op. cit.

[9] On the multiplicity of groups in Judaism in our period (even the Pharisees were divided into 7 groups) with somewhat similar formulae of admittance and probably of regulation see Saul Liebermann, Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXXI, Dec., 1952, pp. 199–206. C. H. Dodd points to the similarity in the ecclesiastical tradition in Paul and Matthew as one example of their dependence on a common and primitive tradition, Expository Times, Vol. LVIII, 1947, pp. 294ff. H. Strack-P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, I, ad loc. suggest that such regulations as are found in Mt. 18:15–17 do not emerge so fixedly in the later Rabbinic sources although their forms are found: were they more typical of the sects than of the more 'normative' Judaism? For the catechesis of sects in Judaism and primitive Christianity, see W. D. Davies, op. cit. pp. 129ff.

2. Of all the four gospels Matthew alone employs the term *teleios* and that only twice in Matthew 5:48 and 19:21. In the *DSS* the Hebrew equivalent or its cognates occur frequently, and it may be urged that the usage of the *DSS* illumines that of Matthew. Thus *DSD* 1:13 which reads: "To direct their strength according to the perfection of His ways" recalls directly Matthew 5:48. So in *DSD* 11:2 the priests are those "who walk perfectly in all His ways." Indeed to walk perfectly in all things is the express aim of the community (*DSD* 1:9, VIII:1, 10b, 26, IX:2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19, X:21): in these passages it is true that perfection is not directly thought of in terms of the *imitatio Dei*: it is rather complete obedience to the Law as understood by the community, a community which is itself designated "a house of perfection" (*DSD* VIII:9). But always the keeping of the law is itself rooted in the concept of *imitatio Dei*.[10] In several passages degrees of perfection appear to be recognized. Thus *DSD* V:24 implies that there is a yearly examination to ascertain the degree of perfection achieved: "And they shall examine their spirit and their deeds, year by year to promote each according to his understanding and the perfection of his way." (See also *DSD* IX:2, X:21). The attainment of 'perfection' envisaged in these passages is clearly a matter of works and yet it is a gift of God (*DSD* XI:2).

The other passage, Matthew 19:16–23, deals with the story of the rich young man who failed to achieve 'perfection' because he refused to give up his all to the poor. Matthew alone calls the enquirer a *neaniskos* [11] and he alone, as stated, introduces the idea

[10] See I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, Second Series, pp. 246f.: H. J. Schoeps again has shown how the concept of perfection in Matthew 5:48 (Luke 6:36 is secondary) connects with the Hebrew *tamim*: see Aus Frühchristlicher Zeit, Von der *imitatio Dei* zur Nachfolge Christi, pp. 286ff. See also A. Marmorstein, Studies in Jewish Theology, 1950, pp. 106ff.

[11] The term *neaniskos* frequently occurs in the LXX; see E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint, Vol. II, where it does not appear at any time to refer to 'novitiate' in the technical sense but merely to youth. So too in I John the use of *neaniskos* is probably not technical, see commentaries by A. E. Brooke, ICC, and C. H. Dodd, Moffatt Series, ad. loc. The significant thing in the Matthean passage is the distinction drawn between "entering the Kingdom," which in Matthew tends to mean "entering the Church," and being perfect, which, as in the *DSS*, involves the surrender of wealth to the poor — the poor meaning in the *DSS* the community itself; while in Matthew it may mean this, see Mt. 5:3, it probably means the literally poor. The 'being perfect' in Matthew would roughly seem to correspond to becoming "a professed" in the *DSS* and the professed were

of perfection into the narrative. Now it is noteworthy that in the *DSS* distinctions are drawn between the novitiates in the community and those who have actually professed membership.[12] The change from the novitiate to full profession coincided with the abandoning of all property, not to the literally poor, but to the community, which, in another sense, constituted the poor.[13] While this obviously cannot be pressed in view of the veneration of the 'Lady Poverty' in many religious circles in the period,[14] it is not impossible that the conception of perfection which breaks through in Matthew 19:21 reflects the same spiritual climate that we find in the *DSS*.[15]

3. In one passage in Matthew there emerges what may be taken as an esoteric motif which is commonly found in the mysteries and in apocalyptic and also appears, however, in the *DSS*. Matthew 7:6 reads: "Give not that which is holy to the dogs neither cast pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you." The sentence is omitted in

---

"perfect." On the term 'poor' in the Early Church see K. Holl, Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde in Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vol. 53, 1921, pp. 937ff.: see criticism in R. N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 1938, ad loc.

[12] See A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, Eng. Trans., 1952, pp. 50f. In *DSD* 1:11–12 we have regulations dealing with the novitiates, these are to bring "all their intelligence and their strength and their power into the Community of God": on the other hand, the professed are to submit themselves to it "in matters of the Law and goods, and rules," *DSD* V:2. Now the word translated power in *DSD* 1:11 is that which is translated goods in *DSD* V:2. And although the Hebrew underlying both translations, i.e., *hôn*, can mean power, see M. Jastrow, Dictionary of the Talmud, ad. loc. there is no justification for A. Dupont-Sommer's distinction on the ground of language alone: W. H. Brownlee renders *hôn* by 'property' in both places, so too J. T. Milik: H. E. Del Medico, Deux Manuscrits Hébreux de la mer morte, 1951, p. 34 translates *richesses* in I:11 and *la richesse* in V:2. G. Lambert gives *les avoirs* in both places. Nevertheless the distinction pointed out by A. Dupont-Sommer does hold, as appears from *DSD* V and VI where, although the novitiate does bring his property with him to the community on his entry therein, it is clear that the property is only abandoned to the community after probation, when the novitiate becomes a professed.

[13] See *DSH* on II:17 Col. XII 2ff. On the basis of this J. L. Teicher, Journal of Jewish Studies, II, No. 2, 1951, pp. 91ff. and No. 3, 1951, pp. 115ff. identifies the sect with Ebionite Christians.

[14] See especially H. J. Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristtentums, 1949, pp. 196ff.

[15] This cannot, however, be pressed. The distinction which Matthew introduces is that between the merely good and the perfect. This, it may be argued, is not that between the novitiate and the professed. Nevertheless, distinctions such as these made in the *DSS* do perhaps help to illumine that drawn by Matthew.

Luke. How is it to be understood in Matthew? There are three possibilities. It may be merely a bit of cautionary *gemara*, i.e., it urges discriminatory caution following on the prohibition of judging in 6:1–5, or again an 'ecclesiastical' addition directed against Gentiles (this would explain Luke's omission of the verse, if he knew it; it might prove distasteful to the readers at which he aimed — the Gentiles),[16] or again it might be merely ironical. This last is unlikely: the deliberateness of the verse is against it. As we shall attempt to prove elsewhere, there is a strong element of *gemara* in Matthew and this verse is undoubtedly such. But what is its purpose? It is probably directed not against the Gentiles or heretics as such but against "those without" whoever they might be. A parallel emerges in *DSD* IX:17. Among the other duties enjoined by the wise men upon the community are: "Further, not to admonish or dispute with the men of the Pit, but to conceal the counsel of the Torah in the midst of men of perversity" — just as Christians in Matthew 6:7 are forbidden to cast the Torah of Jesus before 'swine'. Again in *DSD* IX:22: "Let there be eternal hatred toward the men of the Pit in the spirit of secrecy." The conception of things hidden appears also in *DSD* VIII:12: "And every matter which was hidden from Israel and is found by a man who seeks, let him not hide it from these out of fear of an apostate spirit." Here we are almost certainly, to take Israel, as often, if not always, elsewhere in *DSD*, to refer to the community of the New Covenant which is the true Israel.[17] On the other hand it is

[16] See A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 91.

[17] In *DSD* 1:22f. the meaning of Israel may be doubtful, but in II:22 it refers to the community, as probably also in III:24. In V:6 the community is a "house of truth" in Israel, but in V:5 the community itself is Israel, as in V:22 (so also W. H. Brownlee, op. cit., p. 22 n. 52), V:14 and probably in VIII:4, 5, 10a, 12, IX:3; in IX:6 those who walk in perfection are called Israelites, (see W. H. Brownlee, op. cit., ad. loc.,) IX: 11. In *DSH* II:8 the members of the community, if we are to follow W. H. Brownlee, are the children of Israel: but in *DSH* VIII:10 Israel stands for the people as a whole. It is noteworthy that in *DSD* VIII:12 the phrase *beisrâ'el* has a superlinear reading *leyaḥad*. W. H. Brownlee translates: "Now when these things come to pass in Israel to the community" as if *l'yaḥad* followed *b'isrâ'el*. Probably however *l'yaḥad* is an interpretative note to explain that Israel here refers to the community as such and not to the whole of the people of Israel, a suggestion made to me by W. H. Brownlee. It should be noted that I. Rabbinowitz in a series of papers read to the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis takes 'Israel' throughout to refer to the people as a whole; he does not regard the *DSS* as emerging from a sect.

possible to take Israel here in its usual sense as referring to the people of Israel as a totality, in which case VIII:12 means that there are things hidden from Israel, i.e., the whole of the people, which the seekers in the community may discover: their discoveries are to be transmitted to the council of the community. In any case there is an 'esoteric' knowledge in the possession of the community. The spirit of truth enables the members of the community to walk humbly "in the prudence of all that is discreet according to the truth of the mysteries of knowledge" (*DSD* IV:6).[18]

Taken separately not one of the above three factors can be deemed to carry much weight: it is only cumulatively and especially in conjunction with the many other parallels to New Testament documents, which the *DSS* have been shown to offer,[19] that they gain significance and justify the expectation that perhaps passages dealing with 'knowledge' in the *DSS* can illumine our understanding of Matthew 11:25–30.

II

The emphasis on 'knowledge' in the *DSS* was pointed out by Dupont-Sommer; [20] and, indeed, it is quite unmistakable. The following is an attempt to classify those passages which deal with knowledge in the *DSS*:

[18] See below.

[19] K. G. Kuhn, Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament in Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 1950, pp. 192–211; W. Grossouw, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament in Studia Catholica, Dec., 1951, pp. 289–299 and 1952 p. 1ff. Some scholars have claimed a Jewish Christian origin for the texts, e.g., J. L. Teicher, Journal of Jewish Studies, II, no. 2, 1951, 91ff., No. 3, 1951, pp. 115ff.: the members of the sect were Ebionites, see *DSH* XII:2ff.: the teacher of righteousness was Jesus and the Prophet of Untruth none other than Paul. But see W. Baumgartner, Theologische Rundschau, N.F. XIX, 1951, p. 142. R. Eisler identified the Teacher with John the Baptist. The literature on this need not, for our purposes, be recapitulated, see H. H. Rowley, op. cit., also an unpublished paper by S. E. Johnson, The Jerusalem Church of the Book of Acts and the community of the Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, and K. G. Kuhn, Πειρασμός-ἁμαρτία σάρξ, im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammenhangenden Vorstellungen in Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 1952, pp. 200ff.

[20] The Dead Sea Scrolls, Eng. Trans., 1952, pp. 42, 65 n. 1; also, M. Burrows, in Oudtestamentische Studïen, VIII, 1950, pp. 168f.

1. *Passages where da'ath or its cognates simply mean intelligent discernment.*

DSD III:2

Nor shall his mind [21] (*da'athô*) nor his strength nor his property be brought into the council of the community.

Milik [22] translates *da'athô* as *scientia.* Bo Reicke [23] favors "inclination," or "interest," a sense which is preserved in Brownlee's rendering. The meaning is not so much knowledge as capacity or inclination to know or reason (See Jastrow, op. cit., ad loc.: he gives instances where *da'ath* means reason and mind.). G. Lambert gives "*Son savoir.*"

At least in the second occurrence of *da'ath* in the following from *DSD IX:17f.* it means 'discernment' or something similar:

But to admonish with true knowledge (*da'ath 'emeth*) and righteous law those who choose the way: each according to his spirit, according to the proper reckoning of the time, guiding them with knowledge (*b'da'ath*) and so instructing them in the mysteries of marvel and of truth.

Milik renders the *b'da'ath* by *sapienter.* Doubtless the *da'ath 'emeth* refers to the peculiar knowledge which the sect possessed. Here Milik renders by *scientia*: it may however be that in both instances *da'ath* stands for the special 'knowledge' of the sect.

In addition to the above might be added *DSD VI:9*:

And in that order they shall be asked with regard to judgment and any counsel or matter which concerns the Many each presenting on request his knowledge at the Council of the Community.

[21] W. H. Brownlee also introduces the term 'mind' into his translation of *DSD III:3*

> And defilement is in his restitution
> He cannot be justified while he conceals his stubbornness of heart
> And with darkened mind (*w'hôshec*) looks upon ways of light.

Following W. F. Stinespring, W. H. Brownlee interprets *w'hôshec* as an adverbial accusative, and thus imports the term 'mind' into his translation as above. But this is hardly necessary. J. van der Ploeg Bibliotheca Orientalis, Mei-Juli, 1952, p. 128b prefers "et il regarde vers les ténèbres au lieu de (vers) des chemins de lumière"; J. T. Milik gives "et tenebras intueatur pro viis lucis." In "Manuale Disciplinae," Romae, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1951 ad. loc. H. E. Del Medico, op. cit., p. 38 gives: "c'est l'obscurité qu'il aperçevera à la place des chemins de lumière."

[22] Op. cit., ad loc.

[23] Handskrifterna Från Qumran, Uppsala, 1952, ad loc.

Milik here renders *opinionem suam*. Nevertheless in view of a passage such as VIII:12 this too may refer to the knowledge which each has discovered: he is to contribute this to the common store of secret knowledge. Brownlee's translation of V:19 favors this: he notes the possibility also that the meaning may be "each answering his intimate." [24]

In *DSD* V:12, VII:3, 4, X:9, VIII:18, and *DST* A 1.18, Cl. 11, *da'ath* simply means 'discernment' of some kind or other.

2. *Passages where knowledge is closely associated with the Law.*

DSD I:12

To clarify their mind (*da'athâm*) by the truth of God's ordinances.

Milik renders *Scientia*; according to Bo Reicke, *Interesse* is the meaning of *da'ath* though he translates *hâg*-knowledge.

DSD III:1

For his soul has refused instruction
And knowledge (*da'ath*) of righteous laws.[25]

DSD VIII:9

A most holy abode belongs to Aaron with eternal knowledge to enact laws.

To get this translation Brownlee emends *b'da'ath côlâm* in the text to *b'da'ath 'ôlâm*. This differs from that of J. T. Milik who translates *scientiam omnium eorum*. So J. van der Ploeg and G. Lambert.

DSD IX:17

See above under (1) and below under (3).

[24] He follows H. L. Ginsberg here. See W. H. Brownlee, op. cit., p. 25 n. 20.

[25] Note that J. van der Ploeg, op. cit., p. 128a doubts whether there is a poetic section here: in sapiental literature it is always difficult to state where poetry turns into prose and *vice versa*. J. T. Milik does not print the section as poetry. To achieve this translation W. H. Brownlee emends the text from *bîsûrê da'ath* to *bîsûrê w'da'ath*. He renders *mishpeṭe* by "laws." J. T. Milik gives: "instructiones scientiae, leges iustitiae." G. Lambert does not connect *mishpeṭe tzedeq* with *da'ath* at all; he gives: "car son âme a pris en dégoût les instructions de la connaissance. Il n'a pas accepté pour la conversion de sa vie les jugements de la justice" . . . op. cit., p. 959. But even if we reject W. H. Brownlee's rendering here the connection of knowledge with *mishpâṭ* is clear.

DSD X:25a

And by the subtlety of knowledge (*'ormath da'ath*) I will hedge the [congregation].

Here possibly the "subtlety of knowledge' is meant to refer to knowledge of the Torah (See *DSD* IX:17 below) which was a hedge around Israel and which was itself hedged by the oral law.

It will be noted that in almost all the above passages the meaning of *da'ath* is somewhat like 'discernment' such as we traced in (1) above except that the discernment here centres in the Law.

3. *Passages which express or imply a secret knowledge.*

DSD IX:17

Further not to admonish or dispute with the men of the Pit but to conceal the counsel of the Torah in the midst of men of perversity.

The sect claimed a hidden or secret understanding of the Law.

DSD IX:22

Let there be eternal hatred toward the men of the Pit in the spirit of secrecy.

This may rightly be taken to imply a secret knowledge and one of the baser motives for secrecy.

DSD VIII:18

He who wilfully removes a word from all that He commanded he shall not touch the Purity of the holy men; nor shall he have any knowledge of any of their counsel, until his deeds are purified from every kind of perversity that he may walk in perfection of way.

This implies that when occasion demands there is secrecy even within the community itself: a certain degree of 'perfection' or achievement is the *sine qua non* of being allowed to enjoy 'knowledge'.

Perhaps in this connection it is relevant to note that the community is often designated as that which is dedicated to the truth,[26] i.e., a special truth known to them (See *DSD* 1:5, 11; 11:26; V:3, 10): its members have received instruction (*DSD* III:1, 6,

[26] Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, Observations sur le Manuel de Discipline découvert près de la mer Morte, a paper read to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, June 8th, 1951, ad loc.

13, IV:5). Moreover if we accept Brownlee's rendering at *DSD* X:25 then the congregation of the community is hedged "by the subtlety of knowledge"; he gives:

"And by the subtlety of knowledge I will hedge [the congregation]."

The Hebrew is *wbᵉormat daʿath 'eshôc* [ ]*h*. Brownlee fills the lacuna as *hâʿêdâh* there being no room for the word *hatôrâh*. Bo Reicke refers to Job 1:10 and reads *baʿᵃdâh*; [27] so also J. T. Milik. Whichever of these readings be the original the metaphor of a hedge suggests some kind of peculiar knowledge even if not secret knowledge, and this last in the light of other passages is more probable.[28]

Finally, we have to refer to Brownlee's rendering in *DSD* V:11f:

For these are not reckoned in His covenant, for they have not sought or inquired after Him in His ordinances to know the unconscious sins (*lᵉdaʿath hanistârôth*).

Brownlee's note (op. cit., ad. loc.) on this runs: "Literally, hidden things as in Ps. 19:12. *CDC* III, 14f. (5:1f) interprets these as errors in the observance of the Sabbath and other holy seasons." Lambert and Milik retain the literal meaning, however, so too Bo Reicke. In a later article Brownlee has also accepted the literal meaning.[29]

4. *Passages where knowledge is concerned with the interpretation of events or has an eschatological significance.*[30]

DSD IV:2

The way of the Spirit of truth is to enlighten the heart of man, and to

[27] Where the idiom *sûk baʿad* emerges.

[28] As to the previous line which W. H. Brownlee renders "In the Counsel or Council of Wisdom I will relate knowledge" which is the better translation of *baʿtzath twshiiâh 'saṗtêr* here? If we read *bᵉtzath* in the following line the correct interpretation would seem to be. "In the Counsel of wisdom I will hide knowledge." which was "corrected" by a scribe who misunderstood *baʿtzath* to mean "in the council." The non-corrected reading finds a natural parallel in the next line, as W. H. Brownlee suggested to me.

[29] This is the implicit correction of The Biblical Archaeologist, Sept., 1951, p. 58. It is important to note that the hidden things refer to the peculiar interpretation of the Torah which the Sect cherished, not to cosmological and other mysteries. The covenantal context makes this explicit.

[30] In *DSD* II:3 the phrase "eternal knowledge," literally "knowledge of 'ages' "

make straight before him all the ways of true righteousness, and to make his heart tremble with the judgments of God, and a spirit of humility and slowness to anger, and great compassion and eternal goodness, and understanding and insight and mighty wisdom which believes in all God's works, and leans upon His abundant mercy, and a spirit of knowledge in every purposeful work.

Brownlee rightly compares Jn. 6:28f, 9:3. The member of the community needs to understand the significance of events: his "knowledge" has to do with God's *works* and *ways* and *judgments*.

DSD IV:18ff.

Now God through the *mysteries of His understanding and through His glorious wisdom has appointed a period for the existence of wrong doing*; but at the season of visitation [31] He will destroy it for ever. For it has been defiled by [or, has wallowed in] the way of wickedness under the dominion of wrong doing until the season of the decreed judgment. And then God will purge by His truth all the deeds of man, refining for himself some of mankind in order to abolish every evil spirit from the midst of his flesh, and to cleanse him through a Holy Spirit from all wicked practices, sprinkling upon him a Spirit of truth as purifying water to cleanse from all untrue abominations and from wallowing in [or, being defiled by] the spirit of impurity — so as *to give the upright insight into the knowledge of the Most High and into the wisdom of the Sons of Heaven, to give the perfect of way understanding*.

---

has no eschatological significance perhaps. Its parallel is "life-giving wisdom" and the knowledge referred to here may merely be "knowledge" in the sense of discernment, without any eschatological nuance: this last, however, must not be ruled out. On *da'ath 'ôlâmîm* see M. Delcor, L'eschatologie des documents de Khirbet Qumran, in Revue des Sciences Religieuses, Octobre 1952, p. 370, who takes it eschatologically: the "eternal knowledge" is a possession in this world and also in the world to come. In the same way, he emphasizes that the members have a *gnosis* while they sojourn on earth but that the *da'ath 'ôlâmîm* is also related to the future, when it will be superior to any knowledge possible on earth. See *DSD* XI:3 which speaks of a mystery to come, see below.

[31] In *DSH* VIII:11 W. H. Brownlee translated "for all His summer fruits God will bring into their storehouse, just as He decreed for them through the mysteries of His wisdom." A Dupont-Sommer renders "for all the times of God arrive in their due season in accordance with what He has decreed about them in the Mysteries of His prudence." H. E. Del Medico's translation, op. cit., agrees with that of A. Dupont-Sommer, and W. H. Brownlee has subsequently abandoned the translation he first proposed and now gives a rendering BASOR, September, 1951, substantially like that of A. Dupont-Sommer. The parallels between the language of this passage and much in the N.T. will be obvious: Luke 19:44; I Pet. 2:22; Acts 17:26; Gal. 4:2. The term *râzê* occurs frequently in the *DSS*. For a lexicographical note on it see M. Delcor, op. cit., ad loc.

Here God possesses knowledge of the future — the period of wrongdoing is set by Him and the season of visitation. This knowledge of the *eschaton* which God possesses, He imparts to the upright of way, so that the knowledge they possess enables them also to have understanding of the events of the *eschaton*.

There seems to be an eschatological reference in *DSD* XI:3:

> For from the fountain of His knowledge (*da'ath*)
> He has opened my light,
> And mine eye has beheld the wonders He has done
> And my heart is illumined with the Mystery to come.[32]

Also in *DSH*:

For there is yet a vision for the fixed time; it speaks of the end and it does not deceive (Hab. II:3a).
The explanation of this is that the final time will be of long duration and it will exceed all that the prophets have said for the mysteries of God will be marvellous.
If it delays, wait for it; for it will surely come and it will not be late. (See on Hab. II:3b cited before.)

A. Dupont-Sommer points out that "the final time" here is the ultimate period of history, known only to God. It will be marked by an overwhelming revelation of knowledge:

For the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of Yahweh as the waters cover the sea (Hab. II:14). . . . and then knowledge shall be revealed unto them in abundance, like the waters of the sea.[33]

[32] For his justification of this translation see W. H. Brownlee, BASOR, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 10–12, 1951, 54ff. Appendix H. Difficulty arises in the translation of the last line: Brownlee argues for interpreting *nihᵉieh* as a Niphal participle with reference to the future, hence his translation. H. E. Del Medico reads: "Car de la source de Sa connaissance, il a ouvert Sa lumière et, pur Ses miracles, mon oeil est devenu capable de percevoire et mon coeur s'est éclairé dans la jubilation." He reads *bᵉrôn nihᵉieh*. J. van der Ploeg rejects W. H. Brownlee's translation, op. cit., p. 130a: G. Lambert, op. cit., p. 974, renders the last line as: "et mon coeur a été illuminé par le mystère de ce qui est accompli." This last translation it is claimed by J. van der Ploeg and G. Lambert is supported by a fragment of an unknown work found in the cave, see Revue Biblique, October, 1949, pp. 605ff, where R. de Vaux rendered *lô'yad'w râz nihᵉie*[*h w*] by "Ils n'ont pas connu le mystère passé." Since then, however, I am informed by W. H. Brownlee that R. de Vaux in a private communication to him has retracted and accepted the future reference, as have also I. Rabbinowitz and J. T. Milik, op. cit., p. 156.

[33] A. Dupont-Sommer's translation, op. cit., p. 42.

The comment on Hab. 1:5 — *DSH* II:5 — makes it clear that a mark of the men of the community is that they "know" the nature of the work which God will perform at the end, while unbelievers do not.[34]

The *gnosis* which will mark the final time will be the understanding of all the things which will happen, i.e., it is an eschatological knowledge not only in the sense that it belongs to the final time, but in the sense that it gives insight into the meaning of the events of that time.[35] This kind of knowledge is always the mark of the true members of the community. They are not to take a single step outside any of the works of God, (but to accomplish them) in their time.[36]

Again in *DST*, *Psalm D*, the connection between the works of God and the knowledge which He gives breaks through in the lines: [37]

> For Thou hast caused me to know Thy marvellous mysteries
> And in Thy marvellous Assembly Thou hast exalted my place;
> And Thou hast worked wonders in the presence of many [38] because of Thy Glory.
> And *to make known to all living Thy mighty works.*

5. *Passages which suggest knowledge of a personal or intimate kind.*

It is not impossible that such knowledge is to be understood in *DSD* II:3 and *DSD* XI:3 which we have already cited in other connections. But more certain are the following:

[34] W. H. Brownlee, BASOR, The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll, No. 112, Dec., 1948, p. 10.

[35] M. Delcor, op. cit., pp. 385, 379 n. 1 would make "eternal life" with which he equates the *gôrâl* of *DSD* XI:8 a kind of "*gnosis*"; and he thinks of this "eternal life" as supra-terrestrial, although he also insists that O. Cullmann is right in refusing to recognize a temporal distinction between time and eternity in Jewish thought as in early Christian.

[36] Cf. *DSD* VIII:4.

[37] A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 76.

[38] On *rabbîm* see S. Liebermann, op. cit., and the note by J. van der Ploeg, op. cit., p. 131b.

DSD XI:6

My eye has beheld that wisdom which was hidden
from men of knowledge
And that prudent purpose which was hidden from
the sons of men.[39]

So too in *Psalm E, DST* in the lines [40]

Yes I am only dust and ashes
What could I meditate unless Thou didst
will it
And what thought could I have without Thy
good pleasure?
How could I display my powers, if Thou didst
not keep me alive
And how could I be intelligent if Thou dost
not form my thoughts?

The intimate dependence upon God for knowledge is here clear, as also in the line,

"Nothing has understanding without Thy good pleasure."

It has been suggested that it is not unlikely, that *DST* is, in part at least, the work of the Teacher of Righteousness himself [41] and we have here something like a doctrine of grace, all is of God.

6. *Passages which conceive of knowledge as mediated.*

In *DSD* IX:10f. the full interpretation of Torah awaits the coming of a future prophet [the Teacher of Righteousness revived?]: this Teacher of Righteousness who, according to some, was a Messianic figure is to be the mediator of a new understanding.[42]

[39] Bo Reicke objects to this translation; he prefers "which was hidden from men, providence and that prudent purpose. . . ." So too J. T. Milik.

[40] A. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 77.

[41] A. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., pp. 69 f.

[42] See W. D. Davies, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come, 1952, for the setting of such an expectation in Judaism. The relation of the Teacher of Righteousness to the Messiah has been much disputed. H. H. Rowley, op. cit., p. 143, rejects the identification. The evidence of *CDC*, however, may be regarded at least as ambiguous, although there seems to be nothing in the *DSS* that demands the identification of the Teacher and the Messiah. For bibliographical details see H. H. Rowley, op. cit.

And they shall not depart from the whole counsel of the Torah to walk in all their hardness of heart; but they shall be ruled by the first laws with which the men of the community began to be disciplined until the coming of a Prophet and the anointed ones (m^{e}shîḥê) of Aaron and Israel.

Note that the Mediator when He comes will have his company[43] — according to Brownlee's rendering.[44]

In a passage in the Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll on Hab. II:7f. the coming teacher will not only give new interpretations of the Torah but will also reveal the secrets of the prophets; his teaching will, in short, be eschatological:

The last generation (will hear) from the mouth of the priest whom He has given unto the children of Israel for a teacher to give the meaning of all the words of His servants the prophets . . . by whom God *has related all that is to come upon His people* . . .

The same eschatological reference appears in *DSH* VII:3f. where we read:

And when it says, "That he may run who reads therefrom" its meaning concerns The Teacher of Righteousness to whom God has made known all the mysteries of His servants the prophets.

Note that the prophet Habakkuk is denied knowledge of the "final phase of the end," whereas the Teacher of Righteousness is given this, i.e., all the mysteries; see before on Hab. II:27f. As such he inspires faith, a faith which, along with labor, saves: See *DSH*, VIII:1. The idea of mediation appears again in *DSH*

[43] In this the Prophet resembles the Messiah of Judaism: See references to the Messianic Community which accompanies the Messiah in R. N. Flew, Jesus and His Church, 1938, ad. loc., and references there given and especially A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul and the Apostle, Eng. Trans., 1931, ad loc.

[44] The plural *m^{e}shîḥê* is accepted by W. H. Brownlee, op. cit., Appendix D, p. 50. He alludes to *CDC* II:12 f. If the Teacher is to be identified with the Messiah this fits in with the expectation of a messianic community which should accompany the Messiah. It is, however, rejected by M. Delcor, op. cit., p. 366. J. T. Milik translates without explanation "the prophet and the two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." Lambert and J. van der Ploeg find the text strange. M. Delcor thinks we should read *m^{e}shiaḥ* not *m^{e}shiḥê*. H. E. del Medico, op. cit., p. 33, translates "jusqua ce qu' arrive le prophète et messie d'Aaron et d'Israel." He supplies a lost *h* before *nabi'*. For other treatments, see H. H. Rowley, op. cit. W. H. Brownlee's position seems to us most acceptable. See also M. Black, The Scottish Journal of Theology, 1953.

II:2 where the Teacher of Righteousness (has spoken) from the mouth of God — he has mediated that which is worthy of belief. The whole verse runs:

for (they do) not believe in all that the Teacher of Righteousness (has spoken) from the mouth of God.

As already stated, the authorship of *DST* is unknown: it is not certain whether they are a community product or that of the Teacher himself. In any case either the community or the Teacher, probably the latter, appears there as the mediator.

DSD X:23

With thankful praises I will open my mouth
And the righteous acts of God shall my tongue
continually relate.

In DST, Psalms D, E the members of the community are taught by the Teacher just as the Teacher himself in turn has been taught by God. Note the following, already cited in another connection.

And through me Thou hast illumined the face of many
For Thou hast caused me to know Thy marvellous mysteries
And in Thy marvellous Assembly Thou has exalted my place;
And Thou hast worked wonders in the presence of many
because of Thy glory
And to make known to all living Thy mighty works.
. . . how could I speak if Thou didst not open my mouth
And how could I answer if Thou didst not instruct me?

DST, Psalm A reveals the same consciousness of mediation on the part of the author of the Psalm.

For from Thee proceed my steps,
And if they attack my soul, this also comes from Thee
That thou mayest be glorified when the wicked are
judged *and thou mayest be strengthened in me in the presence of the sons of men.*[45]

In his work of mediation the author of the Psalms suffers scorn,

[45] Translations from A. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit.

ill-usage and rejection, see *Psalm D*; and Dupont-Sommer goes so far as to suggest that we have in the figure of the suffering Teacher of Righteousness an anticipation of the concept of a suffering Messiah which emerges in the New Testament.[46]

III

The above catalogue and classification of the chief passages dealing with knowledge in the *DSS* invites certain conclusions. But first we must reject the temptation of connecting the references to knowledge in these documents with a second century milieu when gnostic movements were a menace to Judaism,[47] as to the Church. And at this point the meaning of terms like 'gnostic' and 'gnosticism' as applied to certain phenomena in the second century must be carefully noted. Casey has pointed out that "there is no trace in early Christianity of 'gnosticism' as a broad historical category and the modern usage of 'gnostic' and 'gnosticism' to describe a large but ill-defined religious movement, having a special scope and character, is wholly unknown in the early Christian period." Accordingly, like F. C. Burkitt,[48] who also regarded 'gnosticism' as referring to aberrant movements within Christianity, Casey treats gnosticism as a Christian phenomenon. He confines the term "to a group of theologians and sects in the second century characterized (a) by their obligations to Christianity, (b) by the autonomous quality of their systems which made them rivals of orthodox Christianity rather than modifiers of it in point of detail, and (c) by a demand for theological novelty which their frequent appeals to a remote antiquity have obscured but not concealed." [49] As will have emerged almost without examination, the knowledge revealed in the *DSS* at no point coincides with gnosticism in this sense.

So too we must reject the view of I. Sonne.[50] He makes the following points. (1) That the use of Scripture by the authors

[46] Op. cit., p. 99. On the debate on this problem see H. H. Rowley, Oudtestamentische Studïen, VIII, 1950, pp. 100ff.

[47] See e.g. A. Marmorstein, Studies in Jewish Theology, ed. J. Rabbinowitz and M. S. Lew, 1950, pp. 1 ff.

[48] The Church and Gnosis, 1932, pp. 4 ff.

[49] The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XXXVI, 1935, pp. 45 ff.

[50] Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXIII, pp. 275 ff.

of the non-Biblical *DSS* [51] reflects the exegetical methods of the *Doreshe Reshumot* who belonged to the second century A.D. (2) That the documents show a strong tendency toward gnostic modes of thinking, e.g., the passage in lines 24 f. of the hymn is directed against the view that Jesus came in the flesh and looks to the doctrine expounded in Col. 1:22 which was rejected by most of the gnostic sects in the second and third centuries. (3) There are other traces of polemic against the Christian use of the Old Testament. Thus Mark 15: 36 and John 19:28 recall Psalm 69:22. The Church Fathers seized on Psalm 69:22 and referred it to Jesus. Sonne does not support his contention here with evidence, but he writes: "The allegorical interpretation of the verse [52] by our author and in other Jewish circles contains in all probability a subtly polemic touch. They would not object to the contention that the verse refers to Jesus. They would, however, construe the verse as branding the doctrine of Jesus with the stigma of heresy.[53] This would support a conjecture we expounded elsewhere that the *Doreshe Reshumot*, to whose school our author seems to belong, used their symbolical method of interpretation mostly in refuting the Old Testament "witnesses" of Jesus' mission." [54] On all these grounds Sonne connects the *DSS* with a Jewish gnostic sect of the second century A.D. Let us examine his arguments in inverse order. It is hardly credible that the figure of vinegar has the polemic intention against Christians he finds therein, and certainly, in view of *DSH* which deals with a part of Scripture which was not markedly used by the Early Church,[55] and of the traces of other commentaries found,[56] it is erroneous to claim that the sect was chiefly concerned with refut-

[51] I. Sonne deals only with one 'hymn' but we can asume that the author of the hymn belongs to the same milieu as the author of the *DSS*; the Psalm concerned is printed by I. Sonne on pp. 287 f. of his article.

[52] He refers to line 7 which he renders . . . "And they withhold the drink of knowledge from those who are thirsty, and give them vinegar to drink in their thirst, so that they may direct their eye to their false doctrine."

[53] I. Sonne takes *ḥômêtz* to be a symbol of heresy.

[54] I. Sonne, op. cit., pp. 298. On the *Doreshe Reshumot* see the Jewish Encyclopedia, ad loc.

[55] See C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 1952.

[56] Thus it is possible that the Sect had "commentaries" on many Old Testament books if not all. Discoveries have already yielded such on Micah and possibly Psalm 107.

ing Old Testament "witnesses" to Jesus' mission. Nor is it necessary to refer to the *Doreshe Reshumot*, about whose exegesis we know little, to elucidate the sect's use of Scripture. This last reflects midrashic usage of a type well known elsewhere.[57] Moreover to find polemic against Col. 1:22 in lines 24 f. is clearly an overrefinement of scholarship. The doctrine of the flesh in the *DSS* is highly significant for the New Testament [58] but the reference to which Sonne appeals is too tenuous to claim that it signifies anti-Christian polemic.

But the term gnosticism has also a wider connotation than that with which we have dealt: it is often used in a more generalized way to refer in the second century and previously to "movements" or groups which emphasized *gnosis*, both in the higher paganism and in the Hellenistic mysteries and elsewhere.[59] Do the *DSS* reveal a *gnosis* similar to this, whether Jewish or otherwise? Bo Reicke has rightly warned us against such a view in footnotes to his monograph Handskrifterna Från Qumran, Uppsala, 1952.[60] And we must agree with Bo Reicke.

If we examine the *gnosis* which characterized Hellenistic mysteries it becomes almost immediately apparent that the knowledge of which the *DSS* speak has little in common with it. At two points there might appear to be, at first glance, a similarity between them. A recent succinct presentation entitled Cadre de la mystique Hellénistique by Festugière [61] recalls us to the fact that two concepts which are central in *DSS* are also central in Hellenistic mysticism, namely those of "revelation" and of "chosenness." *Gnosis* can only come to man if God chooses to reveal Himself and the acceptance of this revelation constitutes those who accept it into a "chosen people" in whose custody lies the *mustêrion*

[57] See W. H. Brownlee, BASOR, Sept. 1951, and his forthcoming article on *DSH* and the Targum of Jonathan.

[58] See K. G. Kuhn, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 1952, Heft 2, pp. 200 ff.

[59] See R. Bultmann in Theologisches Wörterbuch, ed. G. Kittel, Band I, pp. 588 ff. For a convenient statement see E. C. Blackman, Marcion and His Influence, 1949, pp. 82 ff.

[60] Pp. 61 n. 11, 64 n. 23, 67 n. 38. Cf. M. Burrows, Oudtestamentische Studïen, VIII, 1950, pp. 169 f. K. G. Kuhn, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 47, 1950, pp. 192–211 finds "gnosticism" in the *DSS*, see p. 203 ff.

[61] See Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne, Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel, Paris, 1950, pp. 74 ff.

which is hidden from the masses, and cannot be divulged to them. We saw that the initiates of the "Dead Sea Sect," which regarded itself as the true Israel and was therefore "chosen," also had a secret knowledge which was closely related to a revelation — the Law and the Prophets. In this general way the *da'ath* of the *DSS* and the *gnosis* of Hellenistic mysticism are not unlike. But here the similarity ceases. When we turn to the strict content of the Hellenistic "*gnosis*" we find that it differs radically from the *da'ath* of the *DSS*. Festugière summarizes the content of salvation in Hellenistic mysticism in the following terms: "Le contenu de la gnose peut se résumer en trois points. C'est une connaissance:

(1) de Dieu, particulièrement sous son aspect de Savour; (*γν. θεοῦ*);
(2) de soi, en tant qu'issu de Dieu et susceptible de retourner à Dieu (*γν. ἑαυτου*);
(3) des moyens de remontrer à Dieu et du mode de cette remontée.[62] (*γν. ὁδοῦ*).

At none of these three points does the knowledge referred to in the *DSS* coincide with Hellenistic *gnosis*. We saw that the *DSS* do speak of an intimate knowledge of God and of God's grace in giving such knowledge, but its very intimacy possesses a quality which removes it from the *gnosis theou* of Hellenistic 'mysticism.' This, to use the words of Festugière, "implique essentiellement la connaissance du Dieu suprême en tant que transcendant et des Puissances ou Hypostases divines qui jouent le rôle d'intermédiaires (à la fois séparant et reliant) entre ce Premier d'une part et, d'autre part, le monde et l'homme." [63] Knowledge of God and His intermediaries in this sense is not what we find in the *DDS*; nor is there any indication in them of a knowledge issuing in deification — which is the end of Hellenistic *gnosis*.[64] On the contrary the knowledge of which the *DSS* speak coexists with an acute awareness of sin and frailty.[65] And when we turn to points (1) and (2) in Festugière's analysis we find no parallels at all in the *DSS*.

[62] Op. cit., p. 78.

[63] Ibid.

[64] See e.g., Corpus Hermeticum, ed. W. Scott, l. 26, et alia; A. D. Nock in Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation, ed., A. E. J. Rawlinson, p. 105 n. 1.

[65] See e.g., *DSD* X:11, XI:3 f. 9 ff. 12 ff. 21 f.; *DST*, Psalm C. A. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 72.

There we read nothing of *Gnôthi seauton* in the sense of knowing one's origin and destiny nor of the way of ascent from this world to God. In short, the three questions with which gnostics were usually preoccupied, i.e., "Whence evil and by what means? Whence man and how? Whence God?" [66] are not relevant to the understanding of *da'ath* in the *DSS*.

But although the *DSS* do not present us with what Hellenistic circles termed *gnosis* they nevertheless do emphasize their own kind of knowledge. And we shall now seek to describe further its connections and nature. There is one point, as section III (4) above shows where the knowledge of the *DSS* differs sharply from Hellenistic *gnosis*. Although there are passages which suggest that the sect was possibly, and even probably, concerned with cosmological speculations such as were native to the *Ma'aseh Bereshith*,[67] speculations which Bentwich has traced to Hellen-

[66] Tertullian, de Praescriptione, VII.

[67] See *DSD* X:1 ff. and W. H. Brownlee's note BASOR, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 10–12, 1951, p. 38 n. 3; 50 f. Is it possible that there is also a reference to this kind of speculation in *CDC* XVI:1 which according to R. H. Charles asserts that the censor of the camp is "to instruct the many in the works of God," and is to make them "understand His wondrous mighty acts," and "to narrate before them the things of the world since its creation." It is unlikely that there is here any cosmological reference. The Hebrew as given by S. Schechter, op. cit., p. 13 reads: *wi^{e}sapêr liph^{e}nêhem nih^{e}iôth 'ôlâm bprtiâh* and is rendered by him as "and shall narrate before them the happenings of eternity in the Law of God." This would give an eschatological meaning to the sentence and it must be conceded that this fits the context which speaks of the works and acts of God. Notice that S. Schechter reads *b^{e}tôrâh yâh* for *bprtiâh*. The latter word he suggests may be a corruption of *bpṛtiâh*, "in details." This would give a good sense but M. Jastrow, Dictionary of the Talmud, gives no form *pṛtiâh* under *p^{e}raṭ*. R. H. Charles emends *bprtiâh* to *mib^{e}rîithô*, but such a conjectural reading cannot be solid ground for finding a cosmological interest in *CDC*. Moreover the term *'ôlâm* which R. H. Charles renders "world" referring it to the physical universe can only be doubtfully so translated; Hebrew does not have a term for the universe as such; see W. H. Bennett, The Post-Exilic Prophets, 1907, p. 171 f. All this makes it impossible to use *CDC* XVI:1 to support a cosmological interest in *CDC*. Note that while in this article we have used chiefly *DSD*, the evidence of *CDC* on knowledge is similar to that found in *DSD*. In *CDC* also the members of the sect have understanding in the works of God I:1; God has knowledge "of the periods for all the years of eternity" II:8. The emphasis on knowledge also appears in II:2 where God "loveth knowledge wisdom. . . . Prudence and knowledge minister unto Him." In II:10 the Messiah is to mediate knowledge of the Holy Spirit; the community is an instructed one VI:5 cp. VII:18; to them are revealed hidden things V:1 which are however defined as referring to "His holy Sabbaths and His glorious festivals, the testimony of His righteousness and the ways of His truth and the desires of His will," here "the hidden things" do not refer to esoteric doctrines but as elsewhere to God's commands and ways. The term *nistârôth* in *DSS* and *CDC* would seem

istic sources,[68] the *DSS* is mainly concerned with the interpretation of the works of God in history, and especially with events conceived as belonging to the period of the End, that is, with the "mysteries" of the prophecies of the Old Testament. This it is that explains the nature of the so-called commentary on Habakkuk; attempts to describe this as a pure midrash have led to justifiable protests; what it presents rather is a sustained effort to interpret a Biblical prophecy in the light of current events which are regarded as the final events.[69] In short, one of the best ways in which we are to understand the treatment of Habakkuk by our sect is to see in it a parallel activity to that in which early Christians engaged when they exploited the Old Testament in trying to interpret Jesus as the *eschaton*.[70] The exegesis of Habakkuk in *DSH* is eschatological exegesis in this sense. The sect from which it arose thus has affinities far more with apocalyptic than with "gnostic circles."[71] This in turn amply accounts for the

---

to include (1) knowledge of the proper way to observe the holy days etc., but this in turn meant (2) the capacity to interpret the Torah and its mysteries properly and (3) in one passage as we saw the reference is to esoteric cosmological speculation. But such speculation too would be rooted in the Scripture and is not to be confused with the redemptive cosmological *gnosis* of Hellenism, e.g., as in the Hermetica.

[68] See N. Bentwich, Hellenism, 1919, ad loc.

[69] See H. H. Rowley's summary of the literature, op. cit., p. 112 n. 3. He writes "actually DSH is neither like an ordinary midrash nor like the usual commentaries on Scripture books. It is rather an application of the Scripture text to contemporary events and an often forced interpretation of the text in terms of those events."

[70] See on this G. Vermes, Le Commentaire d'Habacuc et le Noveau Testament, in Cahiers Sioniens, No. 4, 1951 where also the relevant literature on the Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll is cited. Cf. I. Sonne, op. cit., p. 277. In the Journal of Jewish Studies, Vol. III, No. 2, 1952, pp. 53 ff., Jesus in the Habakkuk Scroll, J. L. Teicher has sought to prove that "nothing confirms better the identity of *môreh hatzedeq* with Jesus than the arguments used by Vermes himself to the contrary" p. 53. We are not concerned in this article to enter into this controversy but merely to point out the similarity of much in Mt. 11:25–30 with the *DSS*. It should be noted that the parallelism between the early Christian use of Scripture and the "commentaries" of the Dead Sea Sect cannot be carried too far. C. H. Dodd, According to the Scripture, London, 1952 shows that the early Church did not apparently comment on particular Old Testament documents as a whole or use testimony books as Rendal Harris had urged. They used instead certain well defined blocks of Scripture for their purpose.

[71] Contrast A. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 46, who thinks that the sect recalls the *thiasoi* of the Hellenistic mysteries. Again A. Dupont-Sommer, Observations sur le Manuel de Discipline, 1951, has referred to the use of *gâlâh*, *râz*, as indicating a *gnosis*; see p. 21. But M. Delcor, op. cit., points to the significance of the fragments of Daniel in the cave which proved that the sect knew and used that book.

esoteric character of the *da'ath* of the sect, because apocalyptic is in its nature esoteric.[72]

Furthermore not only does the eschatological character of *da'ath* in the *DSS* set it apart from Hellenistic *gnosis* but its connection with the Law is significant of another fact. As Bo Reicke has remarked, the knowledge of the *DSS* is often not so much intellectual as practical: [73] it is not so much understanding as obedience (it can also mean faith, the fear of God). This accounts for the frequency of its occurrence in convenantal contexts, and its close connection with that perfection of way with which we have previously dealt. In short, there is an unmistakably *ethical* nuance to *da'ath* in the *DSS* which is not always a mark of Hellenistic *gnosis*, but links the *da'ath* of which the *DSS* speak with that of the New Testament — where knowledge is never far removed from obedience and is a mark of the ideal future.[74]

Nevertheless, one thing is observable when we seek to understand the circles in which the *DSS* emerged. They seem to have placed a greater emphasis upon the concept of knowledge, whatever its exact connotation, than the more strictly Jewish circles, whose literature across the centuries is preserved in the Old Testament. This may well be due to the influence of Hellenistic factors. We have argued elsewhere that such Jewish and Hellenistic factors cannot be sharply distinguished in the first and preceding centuries even in Palestine itself.[75] It is probably safe to infer

---

Moreover he finds a positive literary influence from Daniel. Thus the term *rabbîm* to designate the community derives he thinks, improbably, from Daniel XI:33 cf. XII:3 etc. It is worth noting here that F. C. Burkitt regarded the *rejection* of eschatology as a distinctive mark of second century gnosticism, op. cit., ad. loc.

[72] Cf. L. Ginsberg, The Journal of Biblical Literature, XI:1. See 4 Ezra, 14:6, 12:37 f., 14:45 ff.

[73] Op. cit., pp. 61 n. 11, 64, n. 23.

[74] On this see R. Bultmann, Theologisches Wörterbuch, Ibid. It would be erroneous to deny all ethical concern to the mysteries; See on this A. D. Nock, Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background in Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation, ed., A. E. J. Rawlinson. But their strength did not lie in that direction, whereas the Dead Sea Sect reveals ethical passion. Along with this goes the strong communal awareness of the *DSS*. Here is no "flight of the alone to the alone" as so often in Hellenistic gnosticism but the recognition of belonging to the true Israel. See on this aspect of the Mysteries, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 90. The societary emphasis of the *DSS* is largely absent in Hellenistic *gnosis* usually.

[75] See W. L. Knox, Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity, 1944, pp. 30 f.; Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 1948, 1–16; Saul Liebermann, Greek in Jewish Palestine, 1942. According to S. Liebermann, and D. Daube in Hebrew

that where the *DSS* emerged Hellenistic influences were sufficiently strong to color the *terminology* of the sect without radically affecting its thought. There is a parallel in the use which the Fourth Gospel makes of Hellenistic terms while often retaining for them a Hebraic connotation.[76]

IV

This reference to the Fourth Gospel brings us back to Matthew 11:25–30 which has often been wrongly regarded as a kind of Johannine outcrop in the Synoptics. Here again it is best to see the use of a terminology which despite its Hellenistic undertones retains an Hebraic connotation. We cannot doubt that the Christian tradition as reflected in this passage was formulated in circles which in many ways were similar to those reflected in the *DSS*. And in particular at one point, in the concept of knowledge, we now suggest that the *DSS* illumines Matthew 11:25–30.

This passage can be understood in two ways: first, as integrally related to its context. The immediate context, it has been held, is

---

Union College Annual, Vol. XXII, pp. 239 ff. even the Rabbinic methods of exegesis have been influenced by Hellenistic modes. See also G. D. Kilpatrick, The Gospel according to St. Matthew, 1946, pp. 105 ff. who warns us in the study of Matthew against "identifying the linguistic frontier between the Greek and Semitic worlds with the cultural frontier between Hellenism and Judaism," and R. M. Grant, The Journal of Religion, XXXI, 1951, p. 213. E. R. Goodenough, in his forthcoming volume, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period, Bollingen Series, Pantheon Books, 1953, shows that the sharp dichotomy between Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism is untenable. See also W. F. Albright, From Stone Age to Christianity, 1946, pp. 274, 337 n. 26. A. Altmann, Gnostic Themes in Rabbinic Cosmology, in Essays in Honour of J. H. Hertz, 1942, pp. 19 ff.

[76] See K. G. Kuhn, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 47, 1950, pp. 192–211; W. Grossouw, op. cit., pp. 285 ff.; does this bear on the question of the date of the Gospel? See W. F. Albright, in BASOR, Supplementary Studies Nos. 10–12, Appendix. On the presence of mystical groups in first century and earlier Judaism which had a "*gnosis*," see references in Paul and Rabbinic Juadism, pp. 14 f., and in I. Sonne, op. cit. Whether Judaism knew a Hellenistic "mystery," see E. R. Goodenough, By Light, Light, 1935, and a *gnosis* of the same kind cannot here be discussed. If it did, it is not revealed in the *DSS*. Dom Jaques Dupont, La connaissance religieuse dans les Épitres de Saint Paul, Louvain, 1949, thinks that it is probable that even in Hellenistic mysticism the conception of *gnosis* derives ultimately by way of Alexandria from Judaism pp. 357–65, and that the Pauline *gnosis* is in no way influenced by the Hellenistic. See the review by R. Bultmann, The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. III, April 1952, pp. 10 ff. J. Danielou, Études, 1950, p. 181, Les Découvertes de Manuscrits en Egypte et en Palestine, finds confirmation for J. Dupont's thesis in the *DSS*.

unsuitable for the passage; the partial parallel in Luke 10:21 f. appears in a far more fitting setting. This is so because the pronoun *tauta* in Luke 10:21 refers to the glowing report of their success brought back by the Seventy and more immediately to the fact that the names of these are written in heaven. But it is easily possible to exaggerate the difference in the context supplied by Matthew and Luke respectively: only the *immediate* context differs. The total context, if we may so express it, is much the same. Especially does the context in both Matthew and Luke deal with events which are eschatological in their significance. The Lukan address in which the Seventy are sent forth closes with the woes on Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum (10:3 f.); these are followed by the report of the Seventy that they have seen Satan fall (10:19), this, which is an eschatological datum (10:24), leads to the command to rejoice because the names of the Seventy are written in heaven. The Lukan context is thus throughout eschatological; and, indeed, it is probable that we are to take the *tauta* in Luke 10:21 to refer not only to the fall of Satan and the writing of the names in heaven, but also to the woes on the cities, as well as to all those things which "prophets and kings have desired to see and have not." Similarly, taken strictly in the light of its context the *tauta* in Matthew 11:27 refers to the woes on the cities of Chorazin and Bethsaida; what has been revealed is the eschatological significance of events of which the judgment upon Chorazin and Bethsaida are a part. In view of the similarity between the total context of Matthew 11:25–30 and Luke 10:21 f. the claim of those scholars, who have urged that the Lukan context is far superior to the Matthaean, and that Jesus would hardly rejoice after pronouncing the woes on Chorazin and Bethsaida, wears thin. In both Matthew and Luke what has been revealed (the *tauta*) has to do with events of eschatological significance. We need not therefore pay too much attention to the claim that Luke has preserved the context more truly than Matthew.

Accepting then the fact that *tauta* in Matthew 11:27 as in Luke 10:21 refers to the awareness of the eschatological nature of certain events, we next note that this "eschatological" awareness is coupled with the "knowledge" which the Father has transmitted

(*paredothê*) to the Son and the "knowledge" which the Son has of the Father, a knowledge which can only be mediated to others by the Son. We thus have the juxtaposition here of insight into the eschatological nature of events — a revealed insight — and an intimate "knowledge" between Father and Son. But we have already shown that in the *DSS* we have precisely this same kind of juxtaposition — insight into the *eschaton* and intimate "knowledge" of God are conjoined.

But, in the second place, it is to be recognized that this understanding of Matthew 11:25–30 in the light of its context can be questioned. Thus it is suggested by Professor Nock to the author that the passage like other sayings of Jesus, is a statement preserved without any special setting, so that we are to treat it in isolation and the comparison we have drawn above between it and the *DSS* consequently falls to the ground. We hesitate, however, to accept this view of the passage. There are certain documents where the various pericopae which constitute them can be treated in isolation but the Gospel according to St. Matthew in particular is hardly such: it presents us with a well-knit architectonic structure in which the parts fit into the whole and are to be understood in the light of that whole.

Nevertheless, even if we treat Matthew 11:25–30 as a passage unrelated to its setting, there is still much in the *DSS* to recall it. Thus the idea of mediation is also present in the *DSS* as we saw, as it is in our passage. Nor are we wrong in finding a spiritual climate comparable to that of Matthew 11:25–30 in *DSD* X:20 f., where we read the following:

> [I am to accept] [God's] ordinance as the measure of times,
> And to practice truth and righteous [purpose]
> And loving devotion toward the humble
> And to strengthen the hands of the timid of heart
> And to teach the straying of spirit understanding
> And to make murmurers wise through instruction
> And to respond humbly before the naughty of Spirit
> And with broken spirit to men of injustice.

Although we find here no strict parallel, nevertheless, the way in which the mission of the Teacher of Righteousness is conceived

does recall the invitation of Christ in Matthew 11:27–30. Indeed the whole sequence in *DSD* X:23–XI:2 is strangely reminiscent of Matthew 11:25–30.

In conclusion, we repeat that the use of knowledge in the *DSS* suggests that it is unnecessary to find the context of 11:25–30 in Matthew a difficulty: the *tauta* can well refer to 11:20 ff. and it is unnecessary to go outside a Jewish milieu to account for our passage. Indeed, the *DSS* reveal a remarkable parallel to what we find there. They probably emerge from a milieu in which Judaism had been invaded by Hellenistic terminology which had not, however, modified its essential nature. It is probable that a similar background is reflected in Matthew 11:25–30.[77]

[77] As stated previously we cannot here discuss the relation of the *DSS* to Christianity or to other movements. The strongest tendency perhaps has been to regard them as Essene, but note S. Liebermann's caution against such identifications in the article already cited. That the problem of *gnosis* in the *DSS*, as will have appeared, is largely a matter of terminological inexactitude is paralleled by the fact, for example, that while most scholars have treated the Pseudo-Clementines as containing "gnostic" material, H. J. Schoeps has found in the Preaching of Peter, which are incorporated therein, an antignostic motif; see his Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums, ad loc.

SACRIFICE AND WORSHIP AMONG THE JEWISH SECTARIANS OF THE DEAD SEA (QUMRÂN)[1] SCROLLS

JOSEPH M. BAUMGARTEN

Oriental Seminary
The Johns Hopkins University

Following the publication of S. Schechter's Fragments of a Zadokite Work [2] in 1910, some scholars [3] examined the possibility of an Essene origin. This idea was suggested by such points of contact as the stricter observance of the Sabbath, the emphasis on ritual purity, and the avoidance of oaths. One of the main objections to this identification was the recurrence in CDC of laws relating to animal sacrifice and the Temple at Jerusalem. For R. H. Charles this fact alone was decisive: "The Zadokites were not Essenes, since they inculcated the duty of animal sacrifice." [4] This judgment was based on the widespread belief that the Essenes were unalterably opposed to the sacrificial cult and the priestly tradition.

The finding of the Qumrân Scrolls and the demonstration of a definite relationship to CDC have greatly enriched our knowledge of these Jewish sectarians, and make desirable a re-examination of the references to the Temple and sacrifice in CDC. This becomes doubly important when we consider that these references are one of the reasons for dating CDC before the destruction of the Temple.

[1] Since this article was written, the discovery of several new caves containing numerous manuscripts in the Dead Sea area has made necessary a change in the designations for the first scrolls found. R. P. R. de Vaux has proposed the following abbreviations for the documents of the first cave at Khirbet Qumrân (1 Q):

1QpH	*pesher* on Habakkuk for the Habakkuk Commentary (DSH)
1QS	*Serekh hayyaḥad* for the Manual of Discipline (DSD)
1QM	*Milḥemet bnê 'ôr* for the War Scroll (DSW)
1QH	*Hôdayôt* for the Psalms of Thanksgiving (DST).

[2] This document is now called "Cairo Fragments of a Damascene Covenant" (CDC).

[3] M.-J. Lagrange, "La secte juive de la Nouvelle Alliance au pays de Damas," Revue Biblique IX (1912) p. 344; R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Oxford (1913), II, p. 790; R. Leszynsky, Die Sadduzäer, Berlin (1912), p. 148 f.; I. Lévy, La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine, Paris (1927), 290–292.

[4] Op. cit., p. 790.

We shall deal in order with the Habakkuk Commentary (DSH), the Damascus Document (CDC), and the Manual of Discipline (DSD) to determine the attitude of each toward the Sanctuary, animal offerings, and other forms of worship. A final section will be devoted to the Essenes.[5]

1. The Habakkuk Commentary (DSH)

DSH is distinguished by severe criticism of the priests at Jerusalem. On Habakkuk 2:6 the author comments:

> The interpretation concerns the wicked priest who was called in the name of truth when he first arose, but when he ruled in Israel his heart was lifted up and he forsook God. He acted treacherously against the laws for the sake of riches, and he robbed and gathered the wealth of men of violence who had rebelled against God. The wealth of peoples he did take, incurring grievous sin, and detestable deeds he worked with abominable impurity.
>
> (DSH VIII, 8–13)

The sectarians apparently accepted the "wicked priest" (no doubt a high priest) at first, but broke away from him when he appropriated sacred property and violated the priestly sanctity. He is referred to as the "priest who rebelled" (DSH VIII, 16). A similar accusation is extended to the "later priests of Jerusalem" (DSH IX, 4 f.). The "city" of Habakkuk 2:17 is taken as "Jerusalem, in which the wicked priest did abominable deeds and defiled the sanctuary of God" (XII, 7–9). The same "wicked priest" persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness and attacked him on the Day of Atonement (XI, 4–8).

The author of DSH esteemed the Temple highly and was deeply concerned with the behavior of the priests in Jerusalem. He denounced the abuses of the party in control of the Sanctuary. DSH does not tell us much, however, concerning the nature of the alleged defilements. It is interesting to note that the teacher, to

[5] No attempt will be made in the following discussion to assign the historical allusions found in the sectarian documents to any particular sequence of events from the period of the Second Temple. The purpose will rather be to clarify the issues which figured in the withdrawal of the group from the main body of contemporary Judaism. I am indebted to Professor W. F. Albright and Dr. S. Iwry of the Johns Hopkins University, who read this paper and offered many valuable suggestions.

whom DSH ascribed the function of interpreting the words of the prophets concerning the future, was himself a priest (II, 8).[6]

2. The Damascus Document (CDC)

One of the striking similarities between DSH and CDC is the fact that the latter reflects a very similar attitude to the sanctuary at Jerusalem. CDC 4:15–18 lists the "three nets of Belial" (the three cardinal sins) with which he has seized Israel: fornication, "wealth," and the defilement of the Temple.[7] The members of the sect are enjoined to "separate from the wealth of evil which is contaminated by vow or ban, and from the wealth of the Sanctuary" (CDC 6:15–16).

There are also specific accusations of laxity in the observance of ritual purity: "They defile the Sanctuary by not separating in accordance with the law, and they lie with her who sees the blood of her issue."[8] According to the law of CDC 12:1–2, sexual relations were forbidden in Jerusalem: "No man shall lie with a woman in the city of the Sanctuary to defile the city of the Sanctuary with their impurity." There is no doubt that the "city of the Sanctuary" is Jerusalem,[9] which is explicitly mentioned in the polemic of DSH against the "wicked priest." It is reasonable to suppose that disagreements over such laws of ritual purity would be involved in the denunciation of the authorities at the Temple.

The concern of the Damascus sectaries for the purity of the Sanctuary may be seen from the fact that they entered a covenant

[6] This teacher may perhaps be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness, who was one of the main leaders of the sect.

[7] Cf. Psalms of Solomon 8:10–12:

> They committed *adultery*, every man with his neighbor's wife.
> They concluded covenants with one another with an oath touching these things;
> They *plundered the sanctuary* of God, as though there was no avenger.
> They trode the altar of the Lord, (coming straight) from all manner of *uncleanliness*;
> And with *menstrual blood they defiled the sacrifices*, as (though these were) common flesh.

The passage refers to the inhabitants of Jerusalem who were punished through Pompey.

[8] CDC 5:6–7; cf. 20:23, "they defiled the Sanctuary."

[9] See Louis Ginzberg, "Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte," *MGWJ* 56 (1912), p. 548.

to avoid the Temple, rather than participate in its desecration:

> And all who were brought into the covenant not to come to the Sanctuary to kindle His altar in vain, they shall be those that close the door, as God said, "Who among you will close its door that ye might not kindle my altar in vain?"
>
> (CDC 6:11–14)

The reference is to Malachi 1:10, where the priests were accused of offering blemished sacrifices. The prophet considered such offerings despicable. Similarly, the Covenanters preferred avoidance of the Temple, as long as its sanctity was not properly observed.

Very instructive in this connection is the designation of the sect as a "house of division" (*bêt peleg*), who went out from the city of the Sanctuary and put their trust in God in the period when Israel trespassed and defiled the Sanctuary" (CDC 20:21). Here the defilement of the Temple and the sectarian schism are explicitly linked.

It is noteworthy that the author of CDC 7:14 f. used the last verses of Amos 5 as a prophetic allusion to the migration of the sect to Damascus. This chapter contains a most vivid denunciation of those who bring sacrifices while practicing injustice and idolatry; it concludes with the utter rejection of such offerings:

> For though ye should offer me burnt-offerings and your meal-offerings, I will not accept them in favor; and the peace-offerings of your fatted cattle will I not look at . . . . Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and meat-offerings in the wilderness during forty years, O house of Israel? Bear then the *sikkût malkekem* and the *kiyyûn çalmêkem*, the star (*kôkab*) of your god, which ye have made for yourselves, and I will cause you to go into exile far beyond Damascus, saith the Lord . . .
>
> (Amos 5:22–27)

In CDC 7:14 f. this passage is applied to the history of the sect:

> The books of the law are the *sukkat ham-melek* . . . *ham-melek* is the congregation, and the *kiyyûn haç-çelāmîm* are the books of the prophets, whose words Israel despised, and the *kôkab* is the expounder of the Law who came to Damascus.

The Prophetic depreciation of insincere offerings is thus taken as

the basis for the abandonment of the Temple worship, which did not agree with the standards of purity observed by the sectarians.[10]

It should be noted that the division was not primarily over the desirability of animal sacrifice, as such. Just as the Prophetic protests were directed against those who would bring offerings to hide evil and injustice, so did these sectarians denounce the transgressions of the priests at Jerusalem, without denying the importance of sacrifice. It is not surprising, therefore, to find in CDC several laws relating to animal offerings.[10a]

CDC 9:14 refers to the ram which was brought for atonement when restitution was made for stolen property according to Numbers 5:8. In CDC 16:13 we apparently have a law forbidding the devotion to the altar of stolen property.[11] Another law limits the number of sacrifices to be brought on the Sabbath (CDC 11:17–18).

CDC 11:18–21 is concerned with the sending of offerings to the altar by the hand of an unclean person. This passage reveals that prayer was, in the opinion of the sect, preferable to impure sacrifice:

> Let no man send to the altar burnt-offerings, meal-offerings, incense, or wood, by the hand of a man unclean with one of the forms of uncleanliness to permit him to defile the altar; for it is written, "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination while the prayer of the righteous is like an acceptable oblation."

As already observed by L. Ginzberg[12] the law is based on a Midrashic interpretation of Proverbs 15:8, where the text reads: "the prayer of the righteous is His delight." By a slight change of the text the author has made prayer equivalent to an offering, more acceptable than unlawful sacrifice. It will be shown that the same theme is found in DSD.

[10] The LXX version of the same passage (Amos 5:25–27) was used by Stephen in an apparent attempt to link the origin of the Israelite sacrificial cult with idol worship (Acts 7:42–43). Cf. Hans Joachim Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums, Tübingen 1949, p. 222.

[10a] G. Hölscher's attempt (ZNW XXVIII (1929), 21–46) to interpret all the sacrificial laws in CDC as figurative references to priestly donations has not been successful. There is no doubt that they refer to real offerings.

[11] Ginzberg, op. cit., p. 683.

[12] Ibid., pp. 445–6.

Some scholars have concluded from these passages that the sectarians continued to offer sacrifices outside of the Temple at Jerusalem.[13] This would be unlikely for a group which displayed such zeal in guarding the sanctity of the Temple and the Holy City. Furthermore, no mention of such a cult is found in any historical source.[14] It is more likely that these laws are survivals from a period when the sectarians were still participating in the worship of the Temple. The law forbidding sexual relations in the city of the Sanctuary may belong to such a period. This sacrificial Halakah, like that of the Talmud, was then preserved in the hope of some day restoring the worship of the Temple to its proper sanctity.

To another category belongs the following law found in CDC 11–21 f.:

> And whoever comes to the *bêt hištaḥawôt*, let him not come unclean and unwashed (?); and when the trumpets blow, the congregation shall come before or after, but let them not interfere with any part of the service.

The term *bêt hištaḥawôt* (lit. "house of prostration") was used to designate a place of worship; it may be derived from Psalm 5:8: [15]

> I will come into thy *house; I will bow down* toward thy holy Temple in the fear of Thee.

From Ben Sira 50:14 f. and the Mishna,[16] we know that the blowing of the trumpets was the signal for prostration on the part of the people present in the courtyard of the Temple and for the beginning of the prayers. The prostrations were a regular part of

[13] S. Schechter, op. cit., p. XV; Adolph Büchler, review of Documents of Jewish Sectaries by S. Schechter, JQR NS III (1912–3), p. 457; against this view, see Ginzberg, op. cit., p. 446.

[14] Outside of the Samaritan sanctuary, which was destroyed by John Hyrcanus, we know only of the Temple of Onias in Egypt, which was not recognized by the authorities in Palestine. Cf. Emil Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes, Vol. III, 4th ed. (1909), pp. 146–7.

[15] Cf. Psalm 99:9; a similar term (from the root *s-g-d*, to prostrate oneself) is the Egyptian-Aramaic *masgedâ* (shrine) which was applied to the temple at Elephentine (A. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C., Oxford 1923, no. 44, line 3). The Arabic *masjid* is probably borrowed from Aramaic (P. Leander, Laut und Formenlehre des Agyptisch-aramaischen, Göteberg 1928, p. 86).

[16] Tamid VII, 3.

the Temple service.[17] L. Ginzberg [18] interprets the latter part of the law as referring to late comers who must not interfere with the service by entering during the blowing of the trumpets. He takes the *bêt hištaḥawôt* as the central synagogue of the sect in Damascus, although he does not make clear the origin of the term. According to this view, the trumpets and prostrations are to be considered as synagogical adaptations of Temple ritual.

The Damascus Covenanters not only continued to respect the sanctity of the Temple, but they also assigned certain functions and privileges to the priesthood. CDC 9:13 f. provides for confession to a priest by one who makes restitution for stolen property and assigns to the priests whatever is not claimed by the owner. The ten-member court of the sect included "four of the tribe of Levi and Aaron" (CDC 10:5). A priest, well versed in the "Book of Hagu," was to supervise every group of ten sectaries (CDC 13:2).[19] The Biblical function of confining cases of leprosy was left to the priest, although he was instructed by the censor (*mebaqqer*; CDC 13:4–7). At the general meetings of the sect, the priests were given preference in seating and procedure (CDC 14:3 f.).

While these honors were granted to the priesthood, the institutions of the community extended a form of priestly sanctity to all the members of the sect. This is illustrated in the following passage, which refers to the foundation of the sect:

> . . . . as God confirmed it to them through Ezekiel, the prophet, saying: "*The priests, and the Levites, and the sons of Zadok* who guarded the vigil of my sanctuary when the children of Israel strayed from them, shall bring near unto me fat and blood." The priests are the repentant ones of Israel who have gone forth out of the land of Judah, and those who have followed with them (*han-nilwîm 'immāhem*), and the sons of Zadok are the chosen of Israel, those called by name, who stand in the end of days . . . (CDC 3:20–4:4)

It is to be noted that Ezekiel, who is quoted by CDC, actually criticized the Levites for straying from God, and singled out for

[17] Cf. Mishnah Tamid VII, 1; Yoma VI, 2.

[18] Op. cit., p. 547.

[19] CDC 13:3–4 provides for replacement by a Levite, if the priest is not sufficiently experienced.

praise "the priests, the Levites, the sons of Zadok" (Ez. 44:15) who remained loyal, the latter designations being appositional to "the priests." In CDC we not only find these in a serial phrase, but the interpretation given ignores the Biblical distinctions. The "priests" are simply the "repentant ones of Israel" [20] and the Levites are those who "follow with them." In the Damascus community both priests and Israelites were thus joined in a common bond (cf. CDC 6:2–3).

The sectarians adhered to a high standard of purity, which was held to impart holiness to all the members of the Covenant. They were "to distinguish between the unclean and the clean" (CDC 6:17), and to "avoid all defilements according to their law" (CDC 7:3). The law of CDC 10:10 f. defined the amount and quality of water to be used for purification.

Thanks to DSD, we are now better able to understand CDC 9:20 f. which ordains exclusion from the *ṭohorāh* as a punishment for transgression of the law. In DSD there are numerous references to the "common purity" (*ṭohorat ha-rabbîm*),[21] also called the "purity of the Holy Men" (DSD 8:17), which may not be touched by outsiders or those who have been expelled from the sect. The term "purity" refers to ritually pure articles, especially food,[22] which like the "common liquids" (DSD 7:20) were accessible only to the initiated members of the sect.

[20] The "repentent ones of Israel" is a general designation for the sectaries; cf. CDC 6:5.

[21] Professor Saul Lieberman has recently pointed out that the word *rabbîm* in this expression refers to the common possession of ritually clean articles by the sectarians (JBL LXXI (1952), p. 203). In DSH IV, 2, however, *rabbim* is used to interpret the word "kings" of Hab. 1:10 and is in parallel with *nikbadîm*. It seems to mean something like "great ones" (cf. Job 32:9 where *rabbîm* is in parallel with *zeqēnîm* (elders) and the Aramaic *rab*, meaning master, superior, or teacher). The word is often applied in DSD and CDC to the members of the sect. Cf. Ginzberg, op. cit., p. 565 and H. Yalon, Kiryath Sefer XXVIII, (Feb. 1952), 66–8.

[22] Cf. the Rabbinic term *tohorôt* referring to food or other articles, prepared with the observance of Levitical precautions. Prof. Lieberman has called attention to the similarities, with regard to ritual laws, between the Dead Sea sectarians and the *ḥaberîm*, members of orders for the observance of levitical purity found in Rabbinic sources (op. cit., pp. 199–206). He notes that the *ḥaberîm* were also referred to as the *rabbîm*. The "purity" was not water used for ablutions, as might be supposed, for DSD 5:13 f. refers to immersion in water as a preparation for touching the "purity." See below.

According to CDC, man has a "holy spirit" which he must guard from pollution:

> And no man shall defile his holy spirit, even as God did separate them. (CDC 7:3–4) [23]

The sacramental institutions of the Damascus sect gave expression to this "holy spirit" and served to compensate for the Temple sacrifices, in which the sectarians no longer participated.

3. The Manual of Discipline (DSD)

It has universally been recognized by scholars that there is a very close affinity in language and ideas between the Manual of Discipline and CDC. It is important, however, to note differences in the characters of the two documents as we have them. While CDC contains both general Halakah based on Biblical law and rules applying only to the discipline of the sect, the regulations of DSD belong predominantly to the latter category. We do not find in DSD any law concerning animal sacrifice. There are only figurative references to sacrificial offerings.

In DSD 9:3–5, the sectarian order is called,

> an institution of holy spirit of eternal truth [24] to atone for the guilt of transgression and sinful infidelity, and for divine favor to the land more than flesh of burnt-offerings and than fats of sacrifice, and an offering of the lips is for judgment as a fragrant offering of righteousness, and perfection of way as the donation of an acceptable oblation.[25]

The communal institutions of the sect are here held to have expiatory value and are considered to be more acceptable than the standard forms of sacrifice. The term "offering of the lips" (*terûmat śefātayim*) is used in DSD to designate prayer.[26] Like

[23] Cf. CDC 5:11 where it is said of the opponents, "they have defiled their holy spirit" (cf. Ginzberg, op. cit, p. 33f.). In DSD 3:7 a "spirit of holiness" is held to be a prerequisite for atonement.

[24] H. *yesôd rûaḥ qodeš le-'emet 'ôlām*. The preposition *le* before *'emet* breaks up an extended construct chain, as it often does in Hebrew (Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar, 129 d). Cf. DSD 5:1 *has-serek le-'anšê hay-yaḥad*," the order of the men of the community" and DSD 4:6 *sôdê rûaḥ libnê 'emet tēbēl*, "the councils of the spirit of the sons of universal truth."

[25] Cf. William H. Brownlee, The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, BASOR, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 10–12, New Haven 1951, p. 34.

[26] Cf. DSD 10:6 where the term "offering of the lips" occurs in a partially obscure list of periods of prayer. The periods enumerated include sunrise, sunset,

the author of CDC, the Dead Sea Covenanters considered prayer and pious conduct to be as valuable as the standard forms of sacrifice.

DSD does not contain any historical description of the development of the sect, and it makes no mention of the Temple or its defilement. It, nevertheless, gives us valuable information concerning the ritual observances of the community.

The Dead Sea sectarians had ritually pure articles to which only the initiated members were given access. The first of these

---

new moons, festivals, and the beginning of the year. The word *terûmat* is also to be restored before *śefātayim* at the beginning of this list (DSD 9:26). The same term is found in an interesting connection in DSD 10:14. The passage reads:

> And I shall bless him (with) the offering of the expression of my lips from (or in) a battle array of men (*ma'areket 'anāšîm*).

The meaning is made clear by the Dead Sea War Scroll (DSW; published by E. Y. Sukenik, Megillot Genuzot, Jerusalem 1948, Vol. I, pp. 18 ff.). DSW provides for two war prayers. The "prayer for the period (or assembly) of the war" (*tefillat mô 'ed ham-milḥāmāh*) was recited by the priests to the arrayed warriors before they went out to battle, while the "praise of the one who causes to return" (*tehillat ham-mēsîb*) was sung by all the men after a victory. On the morning following a battle, the warriors were to "return to their stations where they had arranged the battle array before the slain of the foe had fallen and to bless there the God of Israel" (ibid., p. 24). Thus the battle array was at the same time an array for prayer. In DSD the term "array of men" (*ma'areket 'anāšîm*) means the array of the congregation for prayer. The verb *'rk* is also employed for congregational prayer in the fourth of the Dead Sea Psalms of Thanksgiving published by Sukenik (op. cit., Vol. II, Plate IX, 11. 20–21):

> *weya'arôkû lekāh besôd qedôšim*
> "and they arrange (prayer) unto thee in the council of the holy"

The passage refers to a union of prayer between the heavenly and the earthly congregations, as I hope to show elsewhere. Cf. also Psalm 5:4. It is significant to note the sacrificial character of the terminology used by DSD for prayer: "the portion of my lips" (*menat śefātai*) is another phrase used in this way (DSD 10:8; see Brownlee, op. cit., p. 41, note 29). The idea of prayer as a substitute for sacrifice is an old one. In Psalm 69:31–2 the praise of God with song and thanksgiving is preferred to animal offerings. Ben Sira 35:1 ff. equates observance of the law and piety with the standard sacrifices. In the Prayer of Azariah (1. 14 ff.) "a contrite heart and a humble spirit" are offered in place of sacrifice. The destruction of the Temple brought this conception into even greater prominence. The phrase "and we shall complete bullocks with our lips" (Hosea 14:3) is rendered by the Targum:

> And may the words of our lips be received before Thee like bullocks as an acceptable offering on the altar.

(Cf. Midrash Rabbah, Song of Songs IV, 11; Abot de R. Nathan IV; b. Berakot 32b). In his Book of Precepts, Anan attempted to establish the synagogue and the liturgy as literal equivalents of the Temple and the sacrifices, respectively (cf. Leon Nemoy, Karaite Anthology, New Haven 1952, pp. 211–2). Fasting, charity, the study of the Law, the table in the home, and various other observances were also held by the Rabbis to have the value of sacrifice.

were solid substances called "common purity" (or purity of the Holy Men), which corresponds to the "purity" of CDC. The second and more restricted [27] were the "common liquids" (*mašqeh ha-rabbîm*). Thus, DSD 7:19–20 provides in the case of a man who has been penalized for two years, "in the first, he shall not touch the common purity and in the second, he shall not touch the common liquids."

Immersion in water was required before touching the "purities," but this purification was only effective for the members of the community. DSD 5:13–14 forbids non-sectarians to "enter into water (to be permitted) to touch the purity of the Holy Men, for they will not be cleansed unless they have turned from their wickedness, for uncleanliness is in all transgressors of his word." Various forms of lustration are listed in DSD 3:4–5 (cf. 3:9) all being of no avail to those who fail to join the community.[28]

It is interesting to note the prevalence of lustral terminology used in a spiritual sense.[29] Truth has been defiled by ways of wickedness, but God would cleanse man by "sprinkling upon him a spirit of truth as water purifying from all false abominations and from wallowing in the spirit of impurity" (DSD 4:21–22). To the evil spirit belong "ways of pollution in the service of uncleanliness." [30] Very similar expressions are employed in DSH

[27] According to Rabbinic law, it is possible to immunize solid foods against uncleanliness by preventing them from coming into contact with liquids. Liquids, themselves, however, are always susceptible to impurity. See the important article by Prof. Lieberman (op. cit.).

[28] In DSW the warriors were required to "wash their clothes and to cleanse themselves of the blood of the slain" before reciting the blessing following a victory. (Sukenik, op. cit., I, 24.)

[29] The Judaeo-christian successors of the Essenes, the Ebionites, also believed firmly in the inter-relationship of ethical and ritual purity. They placed extreme emphasis on lustrations, which were for them a form of divine worship. Jesus, they held, had replaced the fire of the altar with the waters of baptism (Schoeps, op. cit., pp. 202 ff.). The identification of the Dead Sea sectarians with the Ebionites, however, which has been proposed by J. L. Teicher (Journal of Jewish Studies, Vol. II, Nos. 2 and 3 [1951]) is contrary to the archaeological evidence from the Dead Sea caves (W. F. Albright, "The Chronology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," postscript to BASOR, Supplementary Studies nos. 10–12, 1951, p. 58). It is also impossible to reconcile the sacrificial laws of CDC and the concern for the purity of the Sanctuary with the outspoken oppositon of the Ebionites to both the sacrifices and the Temple (Schoeps, op. cit., 219–255). The same objection does not apply to the earlier Essenes (see below). The Ebionites have behind them "a long tradition of baptismal sects on the fringe of Judaism" (ibid., p. 206).

[30] DSD 4:10; cf. 5:14, 19–20.

and CDC. It is apparent that purifications and ablutions were of great significance to these sectarians.[31]

To the priests, DSD assigns an exalted position within the community. As in CDC, the sect is conceived as joining Aaron and Israel (DSD 5:6),[32] but while the Israelite sectaries formed a "holy house" (*bêt qodeš*), the priests were to be established as a "most holy institution" (*sôd qodeš qodāšîm*).[33] Legal decisions were made "according to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the Covenant, and according to the majority of the men of the community."[34] DSD 9:7 provides that "only the sons of Aaron shall have authority in matters of law and property."[35] In the council of the community there were twelve lay men and three priests (DSD 8:1).[36] A priest was required to be present in every place where ten men formed a unit of the community.[37] At the sessions of the sectarians, the priests were given preference in seating and procedure.[38] A priest invoked the blessing over the bread or wine before communal meals (DSD 6:5–6).[39] The priests also played a significant rôle in the annual covenant ceremony, which was one of the important institutions of the sect.

The basic form of the covenant ceremony was an alternation between blessings and curses, as prescribed by Deuteronomy 27:11 f. The function of reciting the curses in detail is there assigned to

[31] Prof. S. Zeitlin (The Zadokite Fragments, JQR Monograph Series, No. 1, 1952, p. 26) dismisses the Tosefta (quoted by Lieberman), which records an important exchange between the Pharisees and a sectarian group in the matter of lustrations, as "having no bearing on the Hebrew Scrolls." Why?

[32] The same union is reflected in the eschatological hope for the coming of the "prophet and the anointed of Aaron and Israel" (DSD 9:11). In CDC 12:23 f. the Messiah is to be descended "from Aaron and Israel." Cf. Brownlee, op. cit., p. 50.

[33] DSD 8:5–6; cf. 8:8–9 and 9:6.

[34] DSD 5:2–3, 5:9, 5:21–2, 6:19 and 8:9.

[35] Dr. S. Iwry would interpret the latter regulation as referring only to the future (Brownlee, op. cit., p. 35, note 13).

[36] CDC 10:4 ff. provides for a court of ten judges, four from Levi and Aaron and six from Israel.

[37] DSD 6:3–4; cf. CDC 13:2.

[38] DSD 6:8; cf. CDC 14:3. In accordance with Deuteronomy 20:2–4, DSW provides that the prayer before battle be recited to the assembled warriors by the high priest and his colleagues (Sukenik, op. cit., I, p. 26).

[39] For this and the similar Essene custom, cf. the Baraita b. Horayot 12b: "And thou shalt sanctify him (the priest)" (Lev. 21:8); this refers to all sacred functions: to read the Law first, to recite the blessings first, and to receive a choice portion first.

the Levites, but no such provision is made concerning the blessings.[40] In DSD 2:2–4 the blessings are recited by the priests and are made the basis of the whole ceremony:

May he bless thee with every good
And keep thee from every evil;
And illumine thy heart with wisdom of life,
And favor thee with eternal knowledge;
And lift up His face of mercy toward thee for thine eternal peace.

This text is an expansion of the Aaronide Blessing (Numbers 6:24–26) which was daily recited by the priests in the Temple.[41] The Levitical curses (DSD 2:5–9), too, were not the ones enumerated in Deuteronomy 27:15 f., but were composed as contrasts to the Priestly Blessing:

Cursed be thou, without compassion, according to the darkness of thy deeds;
And damned be thou in the darkness of eternal fire!
May God not favor thee when thou callest;
And may He not be forgiving to pardon thine iniquities;
May He lift up His face of anger for the vengeance due thee,
And mayest thou have no peace at the mouth of all who hold enmity!

Thus the content of one of the important rituals of the Dead Sea Covenanters was of priestly origin.[42]

4. Summary

Before passing on to the Essenes, we shall briefly summarize our discussion of the sectarian documents.

DSH and CDC tell us of a sect which looked with disfavor upon the priests of the Temple at Jerusalem. They accused them of violating the sanctity of the Temple and the Holy City by failure to observe the laws of ritual purity and appropriating sacred property. The sectarians, who were themselves identified with the Zadokite priestly tradition, held that it was preferable,

[40] Neither the text nor the content of the blessings is defined in Deuteronomy. The Rabbis (b. Soṭah 37b) deduce by analogy that the blessings, too, were to be recited by the Levites and were to include both general and specific blessings.

[41] Mishnah Tamid V, 1; Soṭah VII, 2; Rosh Hashanah IV, 5; Ta'anit IV, 1.

[42] The covenant ceremony also included another element of the Temple liturgy, the formula for confession of DSD 1:24–5. See appendix.

under such conditions, not to bring sacrifices to the altar. Consequently, they entered a covenant to avoid the Sanctuary. In support of their position, they turned to Prophetic denunciations of sinful offerings. The Halakah of CDC, however, preserved several laws relating to the Temple and the sacrifices.

The sectarian abandonment of the Temple cult was facilitated by (or gave impetus to) the development of sacred institutions within the Covenant Community. CDC and DSD mention "purities" which were only accessible to the initiated men of the community, after proper purification. Various forms of lustration were customary among the sectarians. Periods of prayer were observed, and this "offering of the lips" was held to be equal in value to the traditional sacrifices. The priestly blessing and the formula for confession, two prominent elements of the Temple liturgy, were included in the annual covenant ceremony. When the sectarians gathered for communal meals, a priest pronounced the blessing over the bread or wine. The Zadokite priests acted as judges and supervised all the affairs of the community. They constituted a "most holy dwelling" within the community, while the Israelites formed a "holy house."

In a wider sense, all the sectarians were united in a sacred order which was to take the place of the Temple sacrifices. It was to be an "institution of holy spirit . . . to atone for the guilt of transgression and sinful infidelity, and for divine favor to the land more than flesh of burnt offerings and than fats of sacrifice" (DSD 9:4 f.).

5. The Essenes

Our direct knowledge of the Essene attitude to the Temple sacrifices comes from two passages. Philo explains their name as a variation of *hosiótēs* (holiness), because "they have shown themselves especially devout in the service of God, not by offering sacrifices of animals, but by resolving to sanctify their minds." [43] We learn here that spiritual sanctification could be achieved, according to the Essenes, without offering sacrifices. Josephus [44]

[43] F. H. Colson, Philo, "Every Good Man is Free," The Loeb Classical Library, Vol. IX, Cambridge 1941, p. 55

[44] Antiquities, XVIII, 1, 5.

throws additional light on the motive for their separation from the Temple cult:

> When they send what they have dedicated to God into the Temple, they do not offer sacrifices, because they profess to have *more pure lustrations*; therefore they keep themselves from the public precincts of the Temple, but conduct their worship separately.[45]

The avoidance of the Temple sacrifices is here based on the claim to have "more pure lustrations." This means that the Essenes adhered to more stringent laws of purity, which were not observed by those who frequented the Temple precincts. The fact that they avoided the "public precincts of the Temple" but continued to send votive offerings shows that no rejection of the Sanctuary was involved.[46] We know that the Essenes placed great emphasis on

[45] Cf. Fr. Kaulen, Flavius Josephus' jüdische Alterthümer, p. 594. *epiteleō thusias* has here the general meaning of performing a religious ceremony; cf. Liddel and Scott, Greek Lexicon, s.v. *epiteleō*. It is very unlikely that the Essenes sacrificed outside of the Temple at Jerusalem.

[46] The view of some scholars (notably R. H. Charles, who used it as the main standard of Essenism in his study of the Pseudepigrapha) that the Essenes completely rejected the idea of animal sacrifice is substantiated only for the later Ebionites. The Christian Ebionites considered the sacrificial cult as the chief sin of the people and declared all Biblical passages dealing with animal offerings to be false pericopes. They welcomed the destruction of the Temple as an inevitable punishment for the failure to recognize the true prophet, who had come to put an end to all animal sacrifice (See J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, London 1890, p. 326 and the recent study by Schoeps (op. cit., ch. 4), which utilizes new sources for the Ebionites). A very similar attitude is displayed by the (Ebionite ?) author of the fourth book (usually dated a. 80 after Christ) of the Sibylline Oracles:

> Happy shall those men be throughout the earth who shall truly love the Mighty God, blessing him before eating and drinking, staunch in their godliness. Who when they see them, shall disown all temples and altars, vain erections of senseless stones, befouled with constant blood of living things and sacrifices of four-footed beasts.
>
> (11. 24–30)

The danger of attributing the same doctrines to the Essenes becomes apparent when they are used as criteria for determining the authorship of Pseudepigraphic works. The Assumption of Moses could not, according to Charles, have been written by an Essene, "for the entire book is interpenetrated with national hopes and aspirations" and "the greatest interest is taken in all the fortunes of the Temple" (Charles, op. cit., Vol. II, 411). While we agree with W. Bousset's characterization of the Essenes as a *Sakraments-gemeinschaft*, it is not necessary to suppose, as he does, that this involved any abandonment of the Aaronide priesthood (Die Religion des Judentums, 3rd ed. 1926, p. 461). R. Leszynsky (op. cit. p. 151) recognized clearly that the Essene avoidance of the Temple was based on differences over ritual purity. The evidence from the "Zadokite" literature makes desirable a reconsideration of Ritschl's theory of a priestly origin for some of the Essene customs (Cf. Schürer, op. cit., II, 668 ff.).

their purifications; the mere contact of a member of lower grade made a ritual bath necessary.[47] Thus, they preferred to send their offerings through others to avoid the risk of contamination.[48]

On the other hand, it appears that not all Essenes avoided the Temple entirely. Josephus [49] reports that a certain seer, Judas, "of Essene extraction," was observing with his disciples as Antigonus passed through the court of the Temple.[50] The "Gate of the Essenes" found in the description of the walls of Jerusalem [51] may have been named after Essenes who used it on their visits to the city from the region of the Dead Sea.[52] We must, in any case, allow for variations within the general category of "Essene." [53]

The ritual character of the Essene communal meals has long been recognized by scholars. It is interesting to note that priests were employed for the preparation and conduct of these meals: "As managers of their income and the produce of their land they

[47] Jewish War II, 8, 10.

[48] As suggested by L. Ginzberg (op. cit., pp. 445–6), it may be this practice to which the law of CDC 11:18–21 refers. The Damascus sectaries also sent votive gifts to the Temple, but they insisted that the messenger be ritually clean.

[49] Jewish War I, 3, 5.

[50] I. Lévy (op. cit., p. 267 ff.), following E. Mittwoch (Zeitschrift fur Assyriologie XVII (1903), 75–82), would see in the "hall of the silent ones" (*liškat ḥaša'îm*) found in the Temple (Mishnah Sheqalim V, 6) an Essene vestige. From the context, however, it is clear that the *liškat ḥaša'îm* was simply the treasury for anonymous ("silent") donations to the poor. Moreover, the Tosefta (Sheqalim II, 16) tells us: "Just as there was a *liškat ḥaša'îm* in the Sanctuary so there was one in every city. Although Mittwoch's etymology is possible, we cannot conclude that the Essenes ever frequented this hall in the Temple.

[51] Jewish War V, 4, 2.

[52] Although the exact location is unknown, this gate was in the Eastern wall of the city, close to the Temple.

[53] The lack of uniformity is illustrated by the Essene oath "to keep faith with all men especially rulers, since no ruler attains his office save by the will of God" (J. W. II, 8, 7) and the similar statement by Philo that there was not among the Essenes "any person making weapons or engines or plying any industry concerned with war" (Every Good Man is Free XII). In the war against Rome, however, John the Essene was one of the chief Jewish generals. Josephus describes him as a man of "first-rate prowess and ability" (J. W. III, 2, 1). It is historically quite conceivable that a pacifistic group should under changed circumstances display marked belligerence. The pious Ḥasidim were the first to flock to the Maccabean ranks in protest against the religious persecutions of Antiochus IV. Dr. Albright has called my attention to the extremely pacifistic stand taken by American Methodists before World War II, which was abandoned in the face of national emergency. W. H. Brownlee (Biblical Archaeologist, September 1950, 65–6) suggests that the Covenanters be identified with the order of marrying Essenes which is distinguished by Josephus from the celibate majority.

elect good men of the priesthood who prepare grain and food." [54] A priest recited the blessing before and after the communal meals, and all who participated were required to purify themselves and to wear linen garments. None of the uninitiated were permitted to enter. These procedures were modelled after the sacrificial meals of the priests.[55]

There is an evident similarity between the Dead Sea sectarians and the Essenes in their relationship to the Temple. The division from the Sanctuary in both cases involved disagreements over Levitical purity.[56] Both continued to honor the Temple and the priesthood as holy institutions, although they ceased to offer sacrifices. Both had sacred rituals which were at first modelled after and ultimately came to replace the Temple worship.

While we cannot, of course, identify the Covenanters and Essenes on the basis of this general resemblance alone,[57] it is evident that one of the major objections to this identification is not valid. The Covenanters did indeed preserve sacrificial Halakah, but their conception of the relative value of other forms of worship, which has now been illumined by the Dead Sea literature, is in fundamental agreement with Essene standards.

[54] Antiquities XVIII, 1, 5; see Schürer's discussion of this passage, op. cit., II, 666.

[55] Cf. J. Derenbourg, Essai sur L'Histoire et la Géographie de la Palestine, Paris (1867), pp. 141–2.

[56] The defilement of the Temple and the sacrifices is a prominent theme in post-Biblical literature (cf. Enoch 89:73, Testament of Levi 16:1, Psalms of Solomon 8:11 ff., the Assumption of Moses 5:3, and II Enoch 45:3).

[57] See the valuable studies by Brownlee (op. cit.) and M. Burrows, (Oudtestamentische Studien, VIII 1950, 165 ff.).

Appendix

The Formula for Confession

DSD 1:24–25 gives a formula for confession on the part of those who accept the covenant:

> We have perverted ourselves! [We have transgressed! We have sin]ned! [1] we have done wickedly — both we and our fathers before us — because we have walked . . .
> נעוינו [פשענו חטא]נו הרשענו אנו [ואב]ותינו לפניני
> ב.לכתנו]

The first three units of this confession are found in the same order in DSD (1:22–3): [2]

And the Levites shall recount the iniquities (*'awônôt*) of the children of Israel, and all their guilty transgressions (*piš'ê 'ašmātām*) and their sin (*ḥaṭṭā'tām*).

The only place in the Bible where this order of threefold confession [3] is found is Leviticus 16:21, in connection with the scapegoat sacrifice:

And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the live goat and confess over him all the *iniquities* of the children of Israel, and all their *transgressions*, in all their *sins*.

This order became standard in the formula of confession recited by the High Priest over the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement:

And so he would say: "I beseech Thee, oh Lord, I have *perverted* myself, I have *transgressed*, I have *sinned* before Thee, I and my household! Pray, oh Lord, do forgive the iniquities, the transgressions, and

[1] This restoration is made absolutely certain by the remnants of the letters on the MSS.

[2] Cf. DSD 11:9. CDC 20:28–9 also has the text of a confession, but the MSS is blurred.

> *wytwdw lpny 'l ḥṭ'nw* [ ] [ ] *'nḥnw gm 'bwtynw*
> and they shall confess before God: "we have sinned [ ] [ ] both we and our fathers."

Schechter read *rš'nw* in the first lacuna; it cannot be seen clearly on the facsimile recently published by Prof. Zeitlin (cf. the facsimile of p. 20 in Schechter's volume). It appears that the formula of CDC was abbreviated to only two units of confession: *ḥṭ'nw rš'nw*.

[3] Exodus 34:7, which has the three words in the same order is a list of divine attributes rather than a confession. In Psalm 51:5 we have only two elements, *pešā'ai* followed by *ḥaṭṭā'tî*.

the sins, which I have committed with *iniquity, transgressed,* and *sinned* before Thee, I and my household."

(Mishna Yoma, III, 8; cf. IV, 2; VI, 2)

In the second century after Christ, this order of confession was disputed by the Rabbis,[4] despite the evidence from Leviticus, and the more logical order, "I have *sinned,* I have *perverted* myself, I have *transgressed,*" was adopted. The sequence in Exodus 34:7 was interpreted in a Midrashic manner. Despite some opposition,[5] the changed order was officially accepted and is found in most subsequent Rabbinical sources.[6] It follows that the confession in DSD was derived from the ancient formula used in the Temple at Jerusalem.[7]

[4] The controversy between R. Meir (flourished a. 150) and the Rabbis is recorded in a Baraita (b. Yoma 36b). R. Meir based his conservative opinion on the evidence from Exodus and Leviticus. The Rabbis held that *'awônôt* were wilful sins, *pešā'îm* were rebellious acts, and *ḥaṭā'îm* were inadvertent errors. They, therefore, favored the confession arranged according to the degree of offense.

[5] The Gemara (ibid.) records the incident of a public reader who was rebuked for reciting the confession in the order of R. Meir. He replied that he was merely following the order found in the Bible. The fact that this reply was left unchallenged in the Gemara led the Gaon Saadiah and R. Hefeç (both 10th cent.) to assume that the minority opinion of R. Meir was sustained. In a responsum to this question Sherîra (later 10th cent.) explained the incident and decided in favor of the majority. He is followed by all later authorities (cf. B. M. Levin, 'Ôçar Hag-ge'ônîm Jerusalem 1934, Vol. VI, 19–20; cf. Maimonides, Yad Ha-ḥazāqāh, Laws of the Day of Atonement Service, chapter 4, law 1).

[6] Pesiqta Rabbati XXXV, 160b:

> Truly, we have *sinned,* we have *perverted* ourselves, we have done wickedly, we have *transgressed,* we have revolted, and we have rebelled.

This is the standard formula to which Mar Zutra (d. 417) refers by its first three words: "Truly, we have sinned . . ." (b. Yoma 87b). The order here agrees with the majority opinion of the Rabbis. The same is true of the other specimens quoted by A. Büchler (JQR NS Vol. III, 1912–3, p. 555). It was only in the actual confession, however, that the modified order of the Rabbis was adopted; in the prayers for forgiveness we find variations:

> . . . grant me atonement for all my *transgressions,* forgive all my *iniquities,* and pardon all my *sins.*
>
> (Yerušalmî Yoma VIII, near end).

(This arrangement of elements agrees with that of Psalm 51:3–4; cf. Job 7:21). In Leviticus Rabbah III, 3 the older order of R. Meir is retained in the prayer for atonement:

> . . . that you may forgive all my *iniquities,* pardon all my *transgressions,* and grant me atonement for all my *sins.*

[7] In 1912 A. Büchler asserted that the synonyms for sin in the confession formula of CDC were taken from the Medieval form of the prayer and that the author of CDC knew the confession in the liturgy of the Jews in Talmudic times. Büchler, however, knew only the defective formula of CDC which consists of the last two elements of the full confession in DSD. We have seen that the latter is in full agreement with the ancient order of the Temple.

REPRESENTATIVE–CHRISTOLOGY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

E. L. ALLEN

King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne, England

Recent discussion of the origin and status of the Christian ministry has focused attention on the *shaliach* in Rabbinical Judaism as a possible precursor of the apostle. The concept, we are told, was primarily a juristic one; the *shaliach* was delegate for another, he acted as an authorized person to whom a definite commission had been entrusted. As such a representative, he was invested with the authority of the person or group he was charged to represent, in accordance with the oft-quoted maxim: "A man's representative is as the man himself." Thus, for example, under rabbinic law, marriage by proxy was possible. Again, a man might actually divorce his wife through such a representative, and even in a matter so personal as this, he could not subsequently undo what had been done in his name. On the other hand, the representative could not undertake independent action. It was assumed that he would keep within the commission given to him; his authority was derivative and therefore conditional upon obedience to his instructions.

The particular instance often cited in contemporary discussion is that of the delegates who were appointed to act on behalf of the whole Jewish community. These appear only after 70 A.D., so that they may not be cited as precedents for the missionary apostles of the Early Church. They were certain rabbis appointed to visit the communities of the Dispersion to collect funds for the maintenance of learning in Palestine. At a later period, we learn of similar delegates who are commissioned to institute teachers, this time within Palestine itself. As a general principle, such rabbis, although already ordained persons, would receive a further ordination to their specific task by the laying on of hands. They were thus set apart to their mission as representative of the community on a religious errand. Further, in the rabbinic interpretation of Scripture, the term *shaliach* is applied to certain groups and persons as commissioned by God. Thus, the term is employed

on the one hand of the priesthood and on the other of Moses, Elijah, Elisha, and Ezekiel.[1]

For the purpose of this article, the importance of the whole conception lies in the fact that a man may act by God's appointment as his delegate. The case of Moses is particularly instructive, since the principle has here a twofold application. "Thou shalt speak unto him (Aaron), and put the words in his mouth: and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do. And he shall be thy spokesman unto the people: and it shall come to pass, that he shall be to thee a mouth, and thou shalt be to him as God." (Ex. 4.15f.) There is to be a transfer of message and authority, in the first place from God to Moses, and in the second place from Moses to Aaron. Aaron is to act for Moses as Moses acts for God. The relation is clearly one that is ethically conditioned in each case. The representative only exercises the authority of the other insofar as he is faithful to his instructions. In the same way, the ideal ruler of Isaiah 11.1–9 is able to vindicate righteousness and restore the lost harmony of man and nature because, on the one hand, he is chosen and equipped with the Spirit, so that divine attributes and powers are transferred to him, and, on the other, he is reverent and obedient to the divine directions. Precisely because he does not "judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears," he is able to act as God's delegate.

There is a New Testament saying, to be met with in several forms, that links together the disciple, his Master, and God. "Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me." (Mk. 9.37) In Matthew the saying appears in a fuller context, part of which occurs also in John: "He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." (13.20) The parallelism is unmistakable. As Jesus is the *shaliach* of the Father, so is the disciple his.

That, to be sure, is the form in which the relation is usually stated. I propose here to adopt the alternative form of statement,

[1] See further Kittel: Wörterbuch, *sub voce* ἀπόστολος.

and to suggest that as the disciple is the *shaliach* of his Master, so is that Master of God. In other words, I shall enquire whether there is not in the New Testament a Christology for which the unique status of Christ is determined by the fact that he is in the world as God's representative. The principle that a man's representative is as the man himself applies here also, and that not only for the authority he exercises but also for the honor he receives. How far the most orthodox type of Judaism could go in this direction (on paper!) is shown by the passage in which Nebuchadnezzar prostrates himself before Daniel and orders "oblation and sweet odours" to be offered to him at the very moment in which he (Daniel) has vindicated the supremacy of his God. (Dan. 2.46f.) The author assumes that every reader will know that homage was paid to God alone, because Daniel stood there purely as his representative.

It would be quite impossible to deal exhaustively with the subject here, and I content myself with singling out certain expressions and ideas that point towards what I would call a representative-Christology. I begin with the answer of Jesus to the high priest's challenge, an answer containing in all its forms the assertion that he who is now condemned unjustly by men will one day be seated at the right hand of God. (Mk. 14.62) In Stephen's dying utterance the same figure of speech appears, except for the difference — whether significant or not — that the Son of man is seen *standing* there. (Acts 7.56) The sons of Zebedee had asked to be seated, one at the right hand and the other at the left, of their Master in his kingdom. (Mk. 10.37) They wished, that is to say, to be next to him in honor, to be his chief ministers. It is in just this relation that Jesus is conceived to stand to God. He who is at the right hand of God exercises his saving power. He acts on God's behalf as his duly accredited delegate.

The imagery goes back, of course, to the passage from Psalm 110 so often cited in the New Testament that we must suppose it to have some basic significance for the Christology of the Early Church. The English and Greek translations of the opening verse obscure the distinction between two types of lordship that is intended in the original. The king — assuming that a king is here addressed — receives not the lordship of God himself but that of

a delegate of his. The title Adonai is one that may be used alike of God and of man, yet the action of sitting at God's right hand removes him from other men and associates him with God. That he sits does not imply that he remains inactive, a mere spectator of the divine victory. His acts are God's acts because he is God's representative. This is precisely the role ascribed in the New Testament to the Risen Lord "who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him." (1 Pet. 3.22) By the resurrection and exaltation God admits him to a share in his sovereignty, so that he exercises the divine prerogatives, among them that of sending the Spirit. The Father promises to send the Spirit, but he actually sends him through the risen Jesus, who, "having received" this gift, pours it forth upon his followers. (Acts 2.33)

There is a Pauline passage in which the thought of Christ's reign as the divine delegate is worked out in some detail, Psalm 8 being drawn upon in addition to Psalm 110. Christ acts in redemption as God's vicegerent after the analogy of man's vicegerency in creation. (1 Cor. 15.20–28) The risen and exalted Christ enters upon a reign, the object of which is to subdue to God all the powers of evil. He is like a commander sent to subjugate a hostile territory; when he has reduced it to obedience, he hands it over to its rightful sovereign. Christ actually does this, and the conclusion of his reign is marked by that abolition of death the foreshadowing of which in his resurrection began it. When all rival powers have been overthrown, he alone is left and in his person all authority is now concentrated. But he does not retain it for himself, he hands it over to the Father. "When all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all." We are probably to think of this puzzling final expression as connoting a merger of authorities rather than of persons, in pantheistic fashion. The lordship of Christ is a delegated one and therefore temporary; the power he wields to subdue his enemies is really God's power as this is vested in him; in the end therefore he will withdraw and God will rule directly and universally. His representative function is therefore dominant in the present phase of *Heilsgeschichte* but it is not eternal.

Turning now to the Synoptists, we may ask whether the mysterious term Son of man, as used by Jesus in self-designation, does not permit of some elucidation along these lines. The original reference of the expression "one like unto a son of man" in Dan. 7.13 does not concern us here. Whether the figure in question is a collective or an individual symbol, whether he comes *from* heaven or is taken up *into* heaven does not affect the fact that his status is that of a delegate of God. So much is implied in the words: "There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." The language is liturgical in character and is such as is used elsewhere of God himself and peculiarly of him. Universality and eternity of rule are divine characteristics throughout Daniel, and the phraseology of the verse cited above echoes the speech of David when he dedicates the treasure he has collected for the building of the temple. (1 Chron. 29.11f.) The one like unto a son of man is the bearer on earth of the sovereignty God exercises in heaven. He is God's plenipotentiary.

The story of the healing of the paralytic in Mark 2 suggests that this is how the term Son of man as used here is to be understood. It is the action of one who is in the world as God's fully accredited representative. He offers the forgiveness of sins to the man before him without any request for this having been made by the man himself; he penetrates to the man's unspoken need and meets it. As a result, he is accused of invading the divine prerogative. He meets the criticism with the claim that this prerogative has in fact been entrusted to him. As God's delegate he acts "on earth" with his power to forgive. In view of such passages as Matthew 16.19 and 18.18f., we are to think of God as ratifying in heaven what has been done by his representative on earth. Of course, as was stressed at the outset and will be seen again in the sequel, it is only because he is one in mind and will with God that Jesus can thus wield his authority among men. It is the same relation to God that enables him to set aside custom on such matters as fasting and the law itself on the sabbath. There is no claim here to divinity in a metaphysical sense, but the simple acknowledg-

ment of his status and mission as God's vicegerent during his ministry.

There can, it would seem, be degrees of representation. One person may receive more of God's authority than another, and as such he is entitled to a larger measure of honor from men. This thought lies behind the great Christological hymn of Phil. 2. Here again the exegetical details do not concern us. We are intended to think of Christ as a pre-existent being who came to earth, lived and died in total obedience to God, and as reward for this was advanced to a higher status than he had enjoyed in his original condition. The new status is extraordinarily lofty, so that he would seem to be placed on a level with God himself. He receives the unutterable divine name; the homage of men and angels, of the living and the dead, is paid to him and this can legitimately be given only to God. Yet it is clear that even in this exalted dignity he is subordinate to God and inferior to him. God is greater than his representative, and the confession that Jesus is Lord must be rendered "to the glory of God the Father." The position is a paradoxical one, since Jesus in one sense is as God while in another he is below him. But the difficulty is resolved once we remember that the delegate is as his master yet is other than his master. The Lord Jesus only receives this singular honor because God has conferred it upon him, and it is rendered to him as his vicegerent.

We have yet to consider the New Testament writer who makes the most sustained use of this Christological pattern, the Fourth Evangelist. One of the dominant ideas of John is that Jesus is in the world as one who has been sent there by God. Again and again he speaks of God as "him who sent me." While he is here, he is wholly under the Father's direction; indeed, he disclaims expressly anything like an independent ordering of his own life. "I am come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me." (6.38) Faith is the recognition of him as one who has thus been sent by the Father. (11.42; 17.21) Such faith, while it is directed to him in the first instance, must not rest on him finally, but on God whose representative he is. "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent

me. And he that beholdeth me beholdeth him that sent me." (12.44f.)

Two passages call for closer attention. The first develops this general idea in a continuous discourse. The Son, it is said, exercises no initiative of his own; he does only what he has learned from the Father. Of the Father's functions one, and that not the least important, for it is the function of judgment, he has expressly delegated to the Son. The fact that he has renounced this office in his favor can only mean that he intends him to receive equal honor with himself from men. (5.19–23) A few verses later, it is made clear that such authority as Jesus possesses is rooted in his life of obedience. "I can of myself do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is righteous; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true." (5.30f.) It is out of place to speak of the "claims" of the Johannine Christ: he appears before us as one who in humble fidelity fulfills his mysterious mission as God's representative among men.

The second passage to be cited in this connection is an *argumentum ad hominem*, in the form of an appeal to Scripture. Again, we are concerned here only with the essential purport of the argument. The word 'god,' it is said, is used in Scripture of some whose appointment or commission was from God — his word 'came' to them. Surely, then, the term "Son of God" may be used legitimately, for one who is God's deputy in a higher and deeper sense, since his relation to God is that of Son to Father? (10.33–36) How John would relate this Christology to that of the Prologue we do not know. What is clear is that in this passage the divine status of Jesus is his *qua* representative of God. And it may be noted here that in John Jesus performs his miracles, not by any power of his own, but by the power the Father gives him in answer to prayer. (11.22, 41; cf. 5.36; 14.10)

What now of the Prayer of Consecration in chap. 17? Jesus begins by speaking of himself as one to whom the Father has given authority and to whom he has delegated a task to be accomplished, as now it has been accomplished. He is the one whom God has sent into this world, and the acknowledgment of him as such belongs together with the confession of the one true God.

And now, before he returns to the pre-mundane glory he once enjoyed, he renders an account of his stewardship, not omitting the unhappy soul he was unable to preserve for God. The disciples who have remained faithful to him are sent out on a mission of which his own mission is the pattern: "as thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them into the world." He is as it were the first and chief of the apostles. And the consummation to which he looks is a fusion in God of his work and theirs, that their representative activity as a group may so reproduce and continue his as an individual that men may be won for faith in him as God's representative. (17.20–23)

Of course, this is far from being the whole of John's Christology. Apart from the Prologue, justice must be done to the tremendous force of the *ego eimi* passages. The natural interpretation of such words as: "Before Abraham was, I am" is the traditional one of a metaphysical identity of the speaker with God. But it is not certain that this is the correct one, and one passage at least suggests caution. "He that sent me is true; and the things which I heard from him, these speak I unto the world. . . . When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that *ego eimi*, and that I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things. And he that sent me is with me; he hath not left me alone; for I do always the things that are pleasing unto him." (8.26–29) There is therefore a distinct possibility that even the *ego eimi* affirmations are to be understood as extensions of what is implied in the principle that "a man's representative is as the man himself."

This possibility is confirmed by the examination of another passage of crucial importance, and one that appears at first sight to fall quite outside the pattern that is here being considered. As the gospel was originally written, it would seem that it was intended to lead up to Thomas's confession, understood symbolically of the generation for which the work was composed. The full confession of Jesus as Lord and God is reserved for those who did not see the Lord, whose insight is purely spiritual. (20.28f.) Certainly, this confession must be taken seriously as deliberately meant by the evangelist. It is in fact his own confession, as it is the one he would elicit from the reader who has followed him

through the life of him who was the Word made flesh. But what exactly does he intend by it? In an earlier verse of the same chapter, Jesus says to Mary: "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." (20.17) It is usual to stress how the Risen Lord here distinguishes between his own relation to the Father and that of the disciples; God is his Father in a sense in which he is not theirs. Far more important, to my mind, is the fact that he whom Thomas is soon to address as God knows that he also must address God as other than himself. In the light of the Easter-glory he still recognizes that while God is near to him as Father he is beyond him as God. He too must say: "My God!" This is exactly the paradox of representation we found in Phil. 2 and elsewhere. He is entitled to divine honor, not because he is on the same level with God, but because he recognizes that he is not. He receives men's homage, subject always to the reservation that it is "to the glory of God the Father." He is the representative of one who has sent him and in whose name and authority he acts.

I would emphasize again in conclusion that there is no wish to deny that there are other Christologies in the New Testament. I do not enumerate them because to do so would detract from my purpose, which is to single out this one as deserving more notice than it has perhaps received. It operates, as indeed all Christologies do, with ancient thought-forms for which it may not be easy to find a modern equivalent, if we demand such. Ritschl's formula: "Jesus has the value of God" is one possible restatement, and the student of doctrine should have no difficulty in finding others. But that is not the question at issue here.

ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM'S PARENTAGE AND EDUCATION

St. John Chrysostom came, according to Socrates (Hist. Eccl. VI, 3), of a good class Antiochene family (ἐξ εὐπατρίδων τῶν ἐκεῖ). Palladius (Dialogus, 5) gives more specific information — υἱὸς γεγονὼς τῶν διαπρεψάντων εὐγενῶς παρὰ τῇ τάξει τοῦ στρατηλάτου τῆς Συρίας. In all commentaries and encyclopedias which I have been able to consult this is taken to mean that his father (Secundus, according to Socrates) had been *magister militum per Orientem*. The words, however, do mean that Secundus (and his forebears) had served with distinction in the *officium* of the *magister militum per Orientem*. Secundus, that is to say, was not a senator of the highest rank, later to be called *illustris*, but a high grade civil servant. This accords with what John says himself in the de Sacerdotio (I.2) of his fortune and birth, that he was not excessively rich or noble by comparison with his friend Basil. It also accords with the story which his mother tells in the same work (I.5) of the struggle which she had to give him a liberal education; her husband's estate was evidently moderate, since to avoid encroaching on its capital, she was obliged to spend her own dowry.

John received a liberal education, studying rhetoric under Libanius and philosophy under Andragathius according to Socrates. Andragathius is otherwise unknown. There is no reason to believe that John was not taught by Libanius, who was at the time the official professor of rhetoric at Antioch, though the letter quoted by Isidore of Pelusium (Epp. II, 42) from Libanius to John, is either spurious or addressed to another John. For what career was this secular education to fit him? Both Socrates and Sozomen (Hist. Eccl., VIII, 4) say for the bar (μέλλων τε ἐπὶ δικανικὴν ὁρμᾶν, προσδοκηθεὶς δὲ δίκας ἀγορεύειν), and the letter of Libanius cited by Isidore and a remark of John himself in the de Sacerdotio (I.4, οὐ γὰρ ἦν τοῦ δικαστηρίου προσεδρεύοντα καὶ περὶ τὰς ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τέρψεις ἐπτοημένον συγγίγνεσθαι πολλάκις τῷ βιβλίοις προσηλωμένῳ) have been held to confirm this statement. The letter is, however, spurious or irrelevant, and John's own words are not decisive; for an ambitious young man learning rhetoric would naturally hang about the lawcourts to listen to real orators, and this activity may have been no more professional than going to the theatre.

It may well be that the statements of Socrates and Sozomen are in fact based on these passages and have no independent value. That this is so is suggested by the different account of John's education given by

Palladius, who had the best chance of knowing. He writes (Dialogus, 5): δεξιωτέρας δὲ ὑπάρχων γνώμης ἐξησκήθη τοῖς λόγοις πρὸς διακονίαν τῶν θείων λογίων. ἐκεῖθεν ὀκτωκαιδέκατον ἔτος ἄγων τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἡλικίαν ἀφηνίασεν τοὺς σοφιστὰς τῶν λεξυδρίων, ἀνδρυνθεὶς δὲ τὴν φρένα ἦρα τῶν ἱερῶν μαθημάτων. H. Moore, the most recent translator of the Dialogus, renders the words πρὸς διακονίαν τῶν θείων λογίων "for the ministry of the Oracles of God," and P. R. Coleman-Norton, the editor of the most recent text, refers in his footnote to other passages in the Dialogus where τὰ θεῖα λόγια means the Holy Scriptures, thus implicitly accepting the same interpretation. But common sense and the context forbid such a translation. A rhetorical education was neither requisite nor desirable for Holy Orders; and Palladius is clearly contrasting John's secular education, with a secular career in view, with his subsequent devotion to sacred learning. Ἡ διακονία τῶν θείων λογίων must be a description — allusive owing to Palladius' avoidance in this rather high-flown passage of vulgar neologisms — of a secular career.

The clue to the phrase is to be found in the double meaning of θεῖος, which can mean not only "divine," but more often than not "imperial." I have not been able to find a parallel for τὰ θεῖα λόγια in Greek, but it is an exact translation of *divina oracula*, which is a not uncommon synonym in the Codes for imperial rescripts, letters and other constitutions (Theod., Nov., vi, xvii, 2, Cod. Just., VII, lxiii, 5, VIII, xxxiii, 3, xlviii, 5). Their διακονία (cf. Just., Nov. 35, § 4, 'qui confectioni legum . . . suum ministerium praebuerunt,' cf. § 8) was performed by the clerks of the *sacra scrinia*, who assisted the *magistri memoriae*, *epistolarum* and *libellorum* in drafting rescripts and letters, and might be promoted to draft laws under the *quaestor sacri palatii* (Not. Dig. Or., XI, 13–15, XII, XIX, Occ., IX, 10–13, X, XVII). This was a service highly appropriate to a young man of John's talents and position. It was one of the more select palatine ministries. The clerks of the three *scrinia* were limited to 62, 34 and 34 respectively (Cod. Just., II, xix, 10; this is a law of Leo; numbers were probably smaller in the fourth century). The *proximi* or senior clerks of each *scrinium* ended their days as senators (Cod. Theod., VI, xxvi, 2 (381) and 4 (386) give them equivalent rank to *vicarii*; they had previously presumably been *clarissimi inter consulares*). And by the first half of the fifth century clerkships were so much sought after that they commanded a good price, stabilized in 444 at 250 *solidi* plus an entrance fee of 15 or 20 (Cod. Just., XII, xix, 7). The *sacra scrinia* were then a very superior service to the *officium* of a *magister militum*, to which John's father had belonged.

Furthermore they were one of the few branches of the civil service where a first class literary education was indispensable; for the emperor's pronouncements had to be clad in correct rhetorical garb.

A. H. M. Jones

Jesus College
Cambridge, England